Vol. LXXIX No. 2 August, 1928

The Ecclesiastical Review

Monthly Publication for the Clergy Cum Approbatione Superiorum

CONTENTS

THE ATONEMENT IN THE LIGHT OF REVELATION AND SOUND REASON.. 113
The Rev. RUDOLPH BANDAS, Ph. D., S. T. D., S. T. M., St. Paul, Minnesota.
SOME ASPECTS OF COLLEGIATE HONESTY..... 123
The Rev. MAURICE S. SHEEHY, M A., Washington, D. C.
THE "PERVERTED FACULTY" ARGUMENT AGAINST BIRTH PREVENTION 133
The Rev. EDWARD J. MAHONEY, D. D., Old Hall, Ware, England.
MODERN PSYCHOLOGY AND THE BOY..... 145
The Rev. PAUL HANLY FURFEY, Ph.D., Brookland, D. C.
THE FRANCISCANS IN NEW MEXICO..... 153
The Rev. JOHN J. O'GORMAN, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada.
ATHANASIUS AND THE ARIAN CONTROVERSY..... 173
The Rev. F. JOSEPH KELLY, Mus. Doc., Detroit, Michigan.
MASS AND OFFICE OF ST. TERESA OF THE CHILD JESUS—3 October..... 183
MASS AND OFFICE OF ST. JOHN BAPTIST VIANNEY, CURE D'ARS—4 August 188
RECORDING THE BAPTISM OF ILLEGITIMATE CHILDREN..... 191
SAYING PRAYERS OF RITUAL IN LATIN OR IN ENGLISH..... 197
TIME AND VESTURE FOR PREACHING FUNERAL SERMON..... 200
PRIEST AND LAW OF ABSTINENCE ON EMBER SATURDAYS..... 201
RECENT PHILOSOPHICAL LITERATURE..... 203
The Right Rev. Monsignor JAMES H. RYAN, D.D., Rector, Catholic University of America

CONTENTS CONTINUED INSIDE

AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW

PUBLISHED AT
113 E. Chestnut Street
Lancaster, Pa.

1305 Arch Street
PHILADELPHIA

GENERAL OFFICES
1305 Arch Street
Philadelphia, Pa.

Copyright, 1928: American Ecclesiastical Review

Subscription Price: United States and Canada, $4.00—Foreign Postage, $1.00 additional

Sole Agents { Great Britain: Burns, Oates & Washbourne, 8 Paternoster Row, London, E. C., 4
Ireland: Veritas Company, Ltd., 24 Upper O'Connell St., Dublin
Australia: W. P. Linehan, 8 Bourke St., Melbourne

Entered, 2 July, 1904, as Second Class Matter, Post Office at Lancaster, Pa., under Act of 3 March, 1879

Altar Wine Supremacy

SINCE 1877

The COVICK Altar Wines are produced in California and have the unqualified approval and commendation of all the Bishops of California.

✣ ✣ ✣

The Chancellor of the San Francisco Archdiocese supervises the making and distribution of the COVICK wines under the authority of His Grace the Most Reverend Archbishop.

The COVICK wines are not only valid and licit matter for the Holy Sacrifice; they are mature wines of the very highest grade and dependability.

✣ ✣ ✣

The COVICK altar wines, because of their rich, mellow, wholesome character, are ideal wines for the fasting priest and no wines anywhere in America are comparable with them.

✣ ✣ ✣

For the convenience of the Clergy throughout the country the COVICK Mass Wines may be obtained from

Fee Brothers
21-27 North Water Street
Rochester, N. Y.

The I. Donnelly Company
408-410 East Ninth Street
Kansas City, Mo.

J. Redmond Covick
33 South Wells Street
Chicago, Ill.

The T. F. Rodden Agency
25 Barclay Street
New York City, N. Y.

or direct from

The Covick Company, 330 Stockton Street, San Francisco, Cal.

The Covick Company

Established 1877 **Incorporated 1900**

CONTENTS CONTINUED

ANALECTA:

SACRA CONGREGATIO RITUUM:

I. St. Jerome Aemilian declared Patron of Orphans and Waifs...182
II. St. Teresa of the Child Jesus declared Patroness (equally with St. Francis Xavier) of Missions..183
III. Changes in Office and Mass of St. Teresa of Child Jesus..183
IV. Office and Mass of St. John Baptist Vianney, Curé d'Ars..188

SACRA CONGREGATIO DE SEMINARIIS ET DE STUDIORUM UNIVERSITATIBUS:

Decree in Canon Law for Laymen..190

STUDIES AND CONFERENCES:

Our Analecta—Roman Documents for the Month..191
Recording the Baptism of Illegitimate Children..191
Saying Prayers of Ritual in Latin or in English..197
Substitution of Vernacular for Latin at Baptism..197
Conclusion of Funeral Service..198
Taking Communion to Sick in Convent..199
Veil before the Blessed Sacrament during Sermon..200
Time and Vesture for Preaching Funeral Sermon..200
Priests and Law of Abstinence on Ember Saturdays..201
When Minister Genuflects, or Kneels, at Foot of Altar..201
Prayers after Low Mass..202

ECCLESIASTICAL LIBRARY TABLE:

Recent Philosophical Literature. (*The Right Rev. Monsignor James H. Ryan, D.D., Rector, Catholic University of America*)..203

CRITICISMS AND NOTES:

Arendzen: Men and Manners in the Days of Christ..212
Lattey: Readings in First Corinthians..213
Kolbe: A Catholic View of Holism..214
Bruehl: Birth-Control and Eugenics..215
Leon: Saint Francois d'Assise et Son Oeuvre..216
Salvatorelli-Sutton: The Life of St. Francis of Assisi..216
Cleary: Ireland's Tribute to St. Francis..216
Lanier: Guide Pratique de la Procédure Matrimoniale en Droit Canonique..218
Cimetier: Pour Etudier le Code de Droit Canonique..218
Knowles: The English Mystics..219
Huvelin-Leonard: Some Spiritual Guides of the Seventeenth Century...219
Eleanore: Through the Lane of Stars..220
Giloteaux-Bond: Victim Souls..220

LITERARY CHAT..221

BOOKS RECEIVED..223

Firms With Episcopal Authorization to Handle Sacred Vessels to Repair Them

BALTIMORE:	JOHN MURPHY CO., Park Avenue and Clay Street.
BOSTON:	BIGELOW KENNARD & CO., 511 Washington Street. THOS. J. FLYNN & CO., INC., 62-64 Essex Street. MATTHEW F. SHEEHAN COMPANY, 22 Chauncy Street. PATRICK J. GILL, 387 Washington Street.
CHICAGO:	BENZIGER BROTHERS, 205-207 W. Washington Street. (Factories: Brooklyn, N. Y., and Bridgeport, Conn.) JOHN P. DALEIDEN CO., 1530-32 Sedgwick Street. ECCLESIASTICAL GOODS CO., 984 Milwaukee Ave. D. B. HANSEN & SONS, 27 N. Franklin Street. EDWARD J. KOENIG COMPANY, 819-823 Rush Street. SPAULDING & CO., Michigan Avenue and Van Buren St. HUBERT GOTZES, INC., 1536 North Clark Street.
CINCINNATI:	BENZIGER BROTHERS, 429 Main Street. (Factories: Brooklyn, N. Y., and Bridgeport, Conn.) FR. PUSTET CO., 436 Main Street.
CLEVELAND:	JOHN W. WINTERICH, INC., 1707 East Ninth Street.
COLUMBUS:	JOHN W. WINTERICH, INC., 80 South Fourth Street.
DENVER:	JAMES CLARKE CHURCH GOODS HOUSE, 1638-40 Tremont St.
MILWAUKEE:	BERGS MANUFACTURING CO., 483-485 Twenty-seventh Street. DIEDERICH-SCHAEFER CO., 413 Broadway. A. WERNER, 649 E. Water Street.
NEW YORK:	BENZIGER BROTHERS, 36-38 Barclay Street. (Factories: Brooklyn, N. Y., and Bridgeport, Conn.) K. BEETAR, INC., 258 Broadway. THE FEELEY CO., 10 W. 50th Street. THE GORHAM COMPANY, 5th Avenue and 47th Street WILLIAM J. HIRTEN COMPANY, INC., 25 Barclay Street. FR. PUSTET CO., 52 Barclay Street. RAMBUSCH DECORATING CO., 2 West 45th Street. THE C. WILDERMANN CO., 33 Barclay Street.
OMAHA:	KOLEY AND SON, 2512 Farnam Street.
PHILADELPHIA:	H. L. KILNER & CO., 1708 Market Street. J. J. McDERMOTT, Room 818, 1011 Chestnut Street. LOUIS J. MEYER, 804-806 Walnut Street. F. C. PEQUIGNOT, 908 Land Title Bldg., Broad and Chestnut Sts. FRANK QUIN & CO., 40 North 9th Street. HERMAN J. WOLF, 539-543 W. Huntingdon Street. WRIGHT MANUFACTURING CO., 127-35 Master Street.
PITTSBURGH:	E. J. LETZKUS, 2006 Jenkins Arcade.
PROVIDENCE:	THE GORHAM COMPANY, Elmwood. W. J. SULLIVAN CO., 96 Jefferson Street. JOSEPH TALLY, 506-512 Westminster Street.
ST. LOUIS:	B. HERDER BOOK CO., 17 South Broadway. MUELLER PLATING CO., 920 Pine St., Imperial Bldg.
ST. PAUL:	THE E. M. LOHMANN CO., 385 St. Peter St.
SAN FRANCISCO:	ECCLESIASTICAL SUPPLY ASSOCIATION, 328-330 Stockton St.
TOLEDO:	THE GERITY-WHITAKER COMPANY, 10 South Superior St.

THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW

EIGHTH SERIES.—VOL. IX.—(LXXIX).—AUGUST, 1928.—No. 2.

THE ATONEMENT IN THE LIGHT OF REVELATION AND SOUND REASON.

THE Redemption is the divinely ordained means of repairing sin. Sin bears the same relation to the Redemption as a problem does to its solution, or as a disease to its remedy. If sin is a misery, the Redemption is a mercy; if sin is a degradation, the Redemption is a restoration; if sin is a bondage, the Redemption is a liberation; if sin is an enmity, the Redemption is a reconciliation; if sin is an offence, the Redemption is a satisfaction; if sin is death, the Redemption is life, and if sin is a mystery of iniquity, the Redemption is a mystery of goodness and love. Just as sin gives rise to a twofold element, namely, guilt and a penalty, so also the Redemption consists of a moral and penal element. Christ satisfied the offence against God by His obedience and love; He expiated the penalty of sin by His sufferings and death. Christ's Atonement was not a mere physical and material endurance of pain, but it was at the same time a personal act of sublime love, perfect obedience, and total oblation of Himself to God. In a word, Christ redeemed us by His loving obedience expressed amid sufferings and death.

Since the days of the Reformation the penal element has in some cases received such undue emphasis and importance that not only the beauty and harmony but the essence itself of the mystery have been obscured. Because certain ideas lend themselves to oratorical extravagance or strike forcibly the imagination, Catholic preachers occasionally make use of expressions which are Lutheran in origin, and which traditional

Catholic theology has always disowned. Christ in His Passion and Death is said to have become an object of God's anger, a malediction and an outcast from God, an object repulsive to the heavenly court, the universal sinner, an anathema in the real sense of the word. He is represented as suffering the pains of the damned, as abandoned and persecuted by the Father, as dying only after God had discharged against Him all His wrath. The God which such conceptions imply, a cruel and sanguinary God, full of fury and vengeance, is, needless to say, the God neither of reason nor of revelation.

Luther unshrinkingly identified Christ with sinners and transferred our sins upon Him: "All the prophets saw this in the Spirit, that Christ would be of all men the greatest robber, murderer, adulterer, thief, sacrilegious person, blasphemer, etc., than whom none greater ever was in the world, because He who is a sacrifice for the sins of the whole world now is not an innocent person, and without sin, is not the Son of God born of the Virgin, but a sinner who has and bears the sin of Paul who was a blasphemer, a persecutor, and violent, of Peter who denied Christ, of David who was an adulterer, a murderer, and made the Gentiles blaspheme the name of the Lord. . . . If, indeed, it is not absurd to confess and believe that Christ was crucified between robbers, neither is it absurd to say that He was accursed and a sinner of sinners." [1] It is to be noted that Luther's conception of the Redemption followed logically from his doctrine on original sin; if man is radically incapable of doing good, if all his actions, performed under the influence of concupiscence, are necessarily evil, if man can at best cloak himself externally with Christ's merits, it is natural that Christ should Himself have been cursed and punished in the place of the guilty.

The famous French orators are fond of certain expressions which are exaggerated, to say the least, and justly deserving of the strictures which they have received from Catholic theologians. Bossuet speaks of an open war waged against Christ by a vengeful God whose justice bursts like a storm over His Son and dies down gradually as the pent-up energy is dispersed in the flood. "I see a vengeful God," he says [2] "who

[1] *Commentary on the Epistles to the Galatians,* à propos of 3:13.

[2] *Œuvres oratoires* (ed. Lebarq), III, p. 416.

exacts from His Son the whole debt that is due". And again, "Divine Justice looks at His Son with flaming eyes, with a glance darting fire. . . . He looks on Him as a sinner and strides against Him with all the adjuncts of Justice Divine." [3] Elsewhere he adds: "It is an unheard-of thing that a God should persecute a God, that a God should abandon a God, and that the abandoner should turn a deaf ear to the plaints of the abandoned; yet this is what we behold on the cross. The blessed soul of our Saviour trembles with the fear of God's wrath, and when it would fain seek refuge in the arms of its Father, it sees His face averted and itself abandoned and delivered over bound hand and foot as a prey to the fury of outraged Divine Justice." [4]

Bourdaloue imagines a sort of a conflict in the bosom of the Divine Being between God's Justice and Mercy; when one is about to strike, the other holds back the threatening sword. Since Christ took upon Himself our sins, it is on Him that Divine Justice will be exercised: "Clothed in the leprosy of sin God's Justice looks on Him as an object worthy of every punishment, wherefore it takes up arms against Him, and sword in hand pursues Him." [5] Forgetful of His Fatherhood, God looks upon His Son as His foe, and declares Himself His persecutor, or rather the chief of His persecutors. Commenting on Christ's dereliction on the cross, Bourdaloue says that "this rejection by God is in a sense the pain of loss, which it behoved Christ to experience for us all." [6]

According to Monsabré, Christ in His Passion is the universal man, the man substituted for sinners of all places and times, the man-humanity. At the sight of Him, Divine Justice forgets the common herd of men, and sees only this strange and monstrous phenomenon on which it will satisfy itself. "Spare Him, O Lord, spare Him, it is your Son. . . . No, no, it is sin, he must be punished." [7] God will have none of Him, He humiliates Him, strikes Him, wounds Him, and crushes Him. "Go, poor leper, deliver yourself of all shame and wounds, go, and be banished from the land of the living." [8]

[3] Ibid., p. 382.
[4] IV, p. 286.
[5] *Œuvres Complètes,* IX, pp. 161 ff.
[6] Ibid., X, pp. 157 ff.
[7] *Conferences, Carême,* 1881, p. 24.
[8] *Conferences, Carême,* 1879, p. 217.

Contemporary exponents of the penal theory carefully avoid these extravagant expressions and anthropomorphisms, although they still defend the fundamental principle of which the former may, in a sense, be considered as oratorical elaborations. Their explanation of the Atonement is based entirely on the notion of God's retributive justice, or, as they prefer to say, on the idea of "law". "Retributive justice", says Shedd,[9] "is necessary in its operation. The claim of the law upon the transgressor for punishment is absolute and indefeasible. The eternal Judge may or may not exercise mercy, but He must exercise justice." "If God does not assert the principle that sin deserves punishment by punishing it," says Dale,[10] "He must assert that principle in some other way. Some divine act is required which shall have all the moral worth and significance of the act by which the penalties of sin would have been inflicted on the sinner."

Others do not emphasize the notion of law but insist that Christ identified Himself with the shame of sin in such a manner that cessation of communion with God necessarily followed. God judged sin upon Christ's head, says Forsyth,[11] and the withdrawal of communion with God on the cross was a necessary expression of that judgment. In that dark hour, writes Denney,[12] Christ had to realize to the full the divine reaction against sin in the race in which He was incorporated. Christ's separation from the Father on the cross, Snowden explains,[13] may be compared to the cessation of the communion of our spiritual life with God, and His death "included many of the characteristics of that of a sin-stained saint cut off by his sin from the realization of God's presence and forgiveness."

The verbal statements of the so-called vicarious penitence and confession theory, if interpreted rigorously, likewise imply an absolute identification of Christ with the sinner. Christ as the universal, "inclusive" man made perfect atonement by revealing a spirit of grief for sin and an acknowledgment of its guilt. Christ in His Passion, says Oxenham,[14] was of-

[9] *Dogmatic Theology*, Vol. II, p. 436.
[10] *The Atonement*, p. 450.
[11] *The Work of Christ*, pp. 83, 243.
[12] *The Christian Doctrine of Reconciliation*, p. 273.
[13] *The Atonement and Ourselves*, p. 180.
[14] *The Catholic Doctrine of Atonement*, p. 72.

fering to the Eternal Father the one perfect act of contrition for the sins of His brethren whose nature He had assumed. He was making a general confession for the iniquities of all mankind, which He had taken upon Himself as though they were indeed His own. " His agony," says Cardinal Newman,[15] " takes the form of guilt and compunction. He is doing penance, He is making confession, He is exercising contrition, with a reality and virtue infinitely greater than that of all saints and penitents put together." The explanations of Campbell,[16] Moberly,[17] and Du Bose,[18] are similar to the above: in Christ who was " inclusively man " humanity was perfectly penitent and uttered its " Amen " to God's judgment on the sin of man.

After this rapid survey, let us briefly examine these penal theories in the light of revelation and sound reason. Sacred Scripture, it is true, attributes salvation to the Cross and to the Blood of Christ. The " word of the cross " (I Cor. 1:18) forms the substance of Saint Paul's message; the Apostle will glory only in the Cross (Gal. 6:14), and will have but one object of knowledge and interest,—" Jesus Christ and Him crucified " (I Cor. 2:2). By the Cross Christ reconciled both the Jews and Gentiles to God (Eph. 2:16), and blotted out the hand-writing of the decree that was against us (Col. 2:14). Through His propitiatory Blood we have redemption and sanctification, peace and reconciliation, remission of sins and salvation from the wrath to come (Eph. 1:7; 2:3). In Christ's expiatory sufferings and death God manifested His hostility to sin and thereby retained His Holiness inviolate (Rom. 3:25-26).

But the New Testament writers never attribute Christ's sufferings and death to Divine anger, even in passages where the line of argument might tend to culminate in such a thought. Such passages as Rom. 8:32; II Cor. 5:21; Gal. 3:13 and Gal. 4:4, 5 do not support such a view; the first text is to be explained in the sense that God inspired Christ with the will to undergo the Passion for us, the other refer to the principle of solidarity. In fact, it seems that the sacred authors deliber-

[15] *Discourses to Mixed Congregations,* p. 339.
[16] *The Nature of the Atonement,* p. 116.
[17] *Atonement and Personality,* pp. 42, 86, 117, 404.
[18] *The Gospel according to St. Paul,* 127, 226, 297.

ately refrained from any language that might suggest that the Son became the subject of the Father's anger, or that His death was due to an ebullition of God's wrath. Descriptions are given implying that Jesus bore sin through a profound realization of what the Divine attitude toward it really is, but in these very descriptions, phrases which might lead to inferences regarding the anger of God being endured by the Son of His love are carefully avoided. Christian faith is always directed to one who was the Son of God, in whom the Father was well pleased, who hung upon the Cross in fulfilment of the mission to which His Father summoned Him, and who must therefore have been in that hour the object of the Father's deep satisfaction and most tender love. As Second Person of the Blessed Trinity Christ is coequal with the Father, and with Him breathes forth the Holy Ghost, the bond, as it were, of their mutual love. Besides, we must remember that all such terms as " anger ", " wrath ", " vengeance ", etc., when applied to God are anthropomorphic and must not, under pain of error, be applied to Him univocally. On the other hand, since *actiones et passiones sunt suppositorum,* the Divine sinless Person of the Incarnate Word could not make His own the sins, contrition, and repentance of mankind.

The penal element alone cannot adequately account for Christ's redeeming work. For what relation is there between the material sufferings on the Cross and the spiritual punishment merited by the sinner, between the physical torments of the Saviour and the eternal damnation of all humanity? The penal theory is especially objectionable because it reduces sin to a more external disorder, and implies that mere material punishment can repair it. Sin, as we have said above, implies not merely a penalty but also guilt; should we stop with the former element, we would well deserve the reproach of St. Anselm: *nondum considerasti quanti ponderis sit peccatum.* Sin is, above all, an offence against God, a free and conscious revolt of the creature against his Creator, and while it is punished it is not repaired by mere pain.

The penal element receives its full meaning and value only when it is intimately and indissolubly associated with the moral element of Christ's obedience, love, and total oblation to God. The Redemption was, from its very beginning, a work

of divine love: "God so loved the world," says St. John (3: 16), "as to give His only begotten son, that whosoever believeth in him, may not perish but may have life everlasting." Through and in Christ, says St. Paul, it hath pleased the Father to reconcile all things unto Himself (Col. 1: 19, 20). The Son undertakes and fulfills His mission in love: "He loved me and delivered himself for me," says the Apostle (Gal. 2:20). "For why did Christ when as yet we were weak, die for the ungodly? For scarce for a just man will one die; yet perhaps for a good man some one would dare to die. But God commendeth his charity toward us, because when as yet we were sinners Christ died for us" (Rom. 5:6-9). In his epistle to the Ephesians Saint Paul exhorts all to "walk in love as Christ also hath loved us, and hath delivered himself for us, an oblation and a sacrifice to God for an odor of sweetness" (5:2). He admonishes husbands to "love their wives as Christ also loved the church, and delivered himself up for it" (5:25). The Redeemer's death was not only a proof of the greatest and most generous love but it was also an act of magnanimous obedience. While Adam's transgression introduced sin and death into the world, Christ's obedience brought justification and life: "As by the disobedience of one man, many were made sinners, so also by the obedience of one, many shall be made just" (Rom. 5:18). A generous love and a perfect obedience culminating in a voluntary sacrifice—*proposito sibi gaudium, sustinuit crucem*—these are the elements to which Sacred Scripture attaches paramount importance. From the bosom of humanity to which He came to restore supernatural life, the well-beloved Son, in whom the Father is well pleased, offers God more honor than that of which sin had robbed Him. This perfect obedience and love which animated the God-Man from His entrance into the world until His death on the cross, constitutes an act of immense reparation, which reëstablishes the supernatural order disturbed by Adam's sin.

The Redemption, then, in its inception, plan, and execution, was a manifestation of God's love: "In times past we were by nature children of wrath even as the rest, but God for his exceeding charity wherewith he loved us even when we were dead in sins hath quickened us together in Christ" (Eph. 2:

2-5). That God loved us even before the death of Christ and that out of love He sent His Son into the world is a doctrine in no way opposed to the teaching that through Christ's expiatory sufferings and death we were reconciled to God. For if God in His mercy could have freely forgiven men's sins, He could also out of the same love, make forgiveness dependent on certain conditions the fulfilment of which He made possible to man. Sufferings and death in the present order of Providence are a punishment of sin. The Son of God was Innocence and Holiness itself, free from all sin; hence He did not deserve to suffer. If Christ freely chose to undergo sufferings and death it was to expiate the penalty of *our* sins. Christ, the Head of the human race, voluntarily took upon Himself sufferings which should have come upon the sinner, in order to manifest thereby God's great love and mercy, satisfy divine justice, and show how heinous and deserving of punishment sin is.

That Christ became a member of the human family, that He was the Second Adam, the Head and Representative of the human race, is a basic principle in the Redemption which cannot be sufficiently emphasized. This solidarity, however, does not imply a substitution of persons but a substitution of effects. "The head and members", says St. Thomas,[19] "are, as it were, one mystical person; hence Christ's satisfaction pertains to all the faithful as to His own members." Though Christ's sufferings were substituted for our punishment, Christ Himself was not punished in the real sense of the word, nor did He become an object of divine wrath. For punishment implies guilt, and guilt presupposes a rebellious will; punishment, where there is no guilt, would be an injustice. Through His loving obedience which manifested itself in suffering and death Christ vindicated God's intrinsic holiness; to characterize this aspect of Christ's work as a "confession", might be legitimate. But to attribute the terms "confession", "contrition", and "penitence" to Christ in such a way as to imply that by becoming a member of the human race He became solidary with the shame and guilt of its faults, is wholly inadmissible. We must carefully exclude from Christ every

[19] *Sum. Theol.*, III[a], q. 48, a. 2, ad 1[um].

shade of culpability or of divine aversion. These terms might be applied to Christ to denote an impression produced on an absolutely pure conscience by the perception of moral evil, an impression intensified by a lively sentiment of the divine holiness and by Christ's great love for men. But the terms are misleading, and the Holy Office, 15 July, 1893, forbade the use of the following expressions: *Cor Jesu poenitens, Cor Jesu poenitentis pro nobis, Jesu poenitens pro nobis, Jesu poenitens.*

But does not that cry of infinite pain on the Cross, " My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me? " (Mk. 15:34), denote a cessation of communion between the Son and the Father? These words, it must be remembered, are a quotation from Psalm 21:1, and, in uttering them, our Lord was no doubt animated by the same sentiments of confidence and trust as the psalmist. The phrase came to the lips of Jesus in His agony not as an isolated cry of utter despair but charged with the meaning of the whole poem from which it is taken. Dr. G. Jouassard,[20] who has made an exhaustive study of this passage in Tradition, tells us that Patristic writers never interpreted the text in the sense of a true abandonment of Christ by the Father. Some of them, following St. Augustine, explain the passage in terms of Christ's solidarity with the human race; Christ is not speaking here on his own account but as the interpreter of a fallen humanity in its utter helplessness and abandonment. At any rate, the words, " My God ", and " Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit " (Lk. 23:46) clearly show that communion between the Father and the Son was not interrupted. The Father abandoned the Son only in a relative and restricted sense, says St. Thomas à propos of Rom. 8:32, in that He did not protect Him against the cruel tortures, but exposed Him to sufferings and death.[21]

Some writers seek an analogy of the Redeemer's sufferings in those mystical states in which the soul enjoys a great spiritual peace and joy, and at the same time suffers intensely because of physical pain or the consciousness of the consequences of sin. But this analogy is deficient since there could be no consequences of sin in the sinless Christ, and since His suffer-

[20] Article, " L'Abandon du Christ d'après saint Augustin ", in the *Révue des Sciences Philosophiques et Théologiques,* July, 1924, pp. 310-326.

[21] *Sum. Theol., III^a,* q. 47, a. 3.

ings were absolutely disinterested. It is true, however, that during the agony and passion our Lord's intuitive vision did not in any way lessen the intensity of His moral and physical sufferings or impede the spontaneous movements of fear, desire, and sadness. The contemplation of saints, since it is not entirely free from sensible activity, diminishes somewhat their physical and moral sufferings. The beatific vision of Jesus, being independent of the senses and of the activity of the soul in so far as it informs the body, did not exercise this moderating influence.

Others compare Christ's dereliction on the Cross to the "passive night" of the spirit in contemplation. The German mystics as Suso, Tauler, and Ruysbroeck, were perhaps the first to explain the forlornness of the dying Christ in this way. In this mystical state the soul is stricken with the terrible thought, persistent and of fearful intensity, that she is cast off and abandoned by God forever, and that she shall never see His face. So utterly terrible is the anguish, and so awful the darkness, that the mind is scarcely able to maintain its balance under this tremendous trial. In her memory she suffers inconceivable agony, for look where she will, she sees only sin. Her every thought and desire appear to be tainted. Her will seems paralyzed and helpless in the midst of this terrible conflict. In her intellect the soul finds only darkness. She cannot pray; she strives for spiritual utterance, and seems held as in a vice so that no touch of sweetness and no ray of light comes to relieve the inexpressible misery of her complete dereliction. While such a state as this is intelligible in the case of saintly men who ordinarily do not have experimental certitude of God's friendship, it is not attributable to Christ, who enjoyed the Beatific Vision. Christ could suffer because of physical pain, or because of the experimental or infused knowledge of the evils which awaited Him, or because of sin which dominated mankind. But He could not be deprived of the beatific vision even momentarily since this would be equivalent to a true abandonment by the Father.

RUDOLPH G. BANDAS.

St. Paul, Minnesota.

SOME ASPECTS OF COLLEGIATE HONESTY.

SIR WILLIAM OSLER in his essay, *The Student Life,* gives this concept of the true student: "Like the Snark, he defies definition, but there are three unmistakable signs by which you may recognize the real article from the Boojum—an absorbing desire to know the truth, an unswerving steadfastness in its pursuit, and an open, honest heart, free from suspicion, guile, and jealousy."

The genuine student then is not always the one who has secured the most comprehensive grasp of knowledge. We are so constituted that to know the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, is beyond human capability: from this it follows that humility is ever the characteristic of one who is a true student, and history reveals that the gifted minds which have moulded the thought of the ages have ever been tenderly deferential toward their own shortcomings. What Sir William calls "Mindblindness" is a greater tragedy than ignorance to one who professes to be a knight of truth. It is the state in which one can not recognize the truth, though it stares him in the face—a condition that may persist after years of research.

The ultimate perdition for the true student is not even to be placed in such an unhappy state. In my opinion it rests upon this anomaly, that he who grasps the truth is unable to enrich by it either his own life or the life of others. Like Midas in legend, the gold at his command appears but to mock his heart's desire. I have used the word "perdition" advisedly: for is not such a state suggestive of that of the damned whose knowledge of the Supreme Truth but embitters their own destruction?

Effort to convert truth into life is always commendable. However, we have a right to presume such effort in one who is a true student. There are different terms to describe this effort. One such consecrated phrase is "Honesty". It involves study of oneself and one's neighbor, of persons and things, but over and above this it demands a regulation of one's conduct, speech, and even thought, according to the truth discovered. The consequent integrity of life is one of the great joys of living. There is a happy verse illustrating this thought in Beaumont and Fletcher's *Honest Man's Fortune.*

Man is his own star; and the soul that can
Render an honest and a perfect man
Commands all light, all influence, all fate;
Nothing in him falls early or too late,
Our acts our angels are, or good or ill,
Our fatal shadows that walk by us still.

I.

One of the fallacies to which the collegian is inclined is to consider life an abstract future thing rather than the reality of the moment. The reaction against this has been manifest among educators who insist upon college as the laboratory of life. The reaction has some rather unpleasant signification because it at times has emphasized experimentation in fields where such effort is both unnecessary and dangerous. One may sometimes, it is true, discover a truth from contrast, but it is not advisable to learn the value of virtue from the practice of vice.

The relation of truth to oneself in the daily routine of school affords one field of experimentation in which the true student, if I may harp on that expression, may learn a most valuable lesson of the art of living in such a way as to make it dynamic in his future life. The plea to make college life a laboratory of life is largely superfluous because it can not in this regard be otherwise: lessons of dishonesty and lessons of honesty there practised, because of the unity of life, must be lasting in their impress.

The results of collegiate experimentation in the field of honesty, whether because they are too intangible or too obvious, are insufficiently recorded. In certain fields it would appear that the student is increasingly honest in his relations with others. A standard of honor has permeated athletic endeavor that was unknown twenty years ago when schools "borrowed" athletes, or employed them, and employed questionable methods in establishing their prestige. A cursory study of the codes governing athletic relations in this country has revealed a very high standard. There is every indication that an honest effort is made by collegians to exemplify the finer interpretations of courtesy in this regard. As an indication, a major university was subjected, because it barred from

competition a famous athlete on purely technical grounds, to a storm of protest in which even its opponents joined. I have witnessed a spirited contest for a college championship in which the losing team yielded the palm of victory to its opponents by refusing to permit enforcement of a discreditable decision of the referee. Although the act cost the team a championship, its student body vigorously supported its manifestation of honor. Encouragement of such conduct is such on the campus to-day that the great majority of students in intercollegiate athletics exemplify fair play, not merely because athletic endeavor is the field most subject to public scrutiny, but because of the high social valuation discovered in such honesty.

Another similar indication of student honesty is in the field of intercollegiate debating. Where such contacts, although happening among the serious students, are tinged by a feeling of rivalry, there is danger of unfairness. All the evidence points to the contrary. It is the custom in many places to have the decision at these debates rendered by an audience whose prejudice is naturally with the home team. These decisions are often eloquent of disinterested fairness: they receive but too little attention from self-constituted collegiate critics.

I have been here considering the interpretation of honesty in extra-curricular activities. Perhaps I shall be accused of optimism if I hold that as regards the practice of collegiate thievery there has been a decided change for the better. While I have no positive evidence sufficient to prove such a statement, I am quite sure that contrary evidence is also lacking. Those who have administrative responsibilities in a college are not as much concerned with this problem as in days past, although there is a remnant of distress in those whose collegiate information is based upon hearsay, fiction, or the exaggerations of popular college movies.

II.

If I must tender an apology for offering observations on collegiate honesty in fields in which we have little positive data, it is this—to suggest a perspective from which the particular aspect here considered must not be isolated. Successful character building must rest upon all-roundness of mind and com-

pleteness of character. The strong reaction against specialization in education is because it enshrines narrowness of mind: there should be an equal opposition toward incompleteness of character. It is hard to explain the life of a head-hunter who exhibits tender love toward his children and yet exults in the trophies of his bloody conquest. Faulty education largely establishes this paradoxical situation. It is hard to explain likewise the life of a young man who cherishes and attempts realization of honesty in many regards, but in one instance tolerates and practises gross misrepresentation of the truth.

The problem in question is that of dishonesty in examinations, a conscious attempt on the part of the student to misrepresent his worth by means which he recognizes as dishonest. Here I might note a strange paradox. Many of the students whose testimony is here quoted, in a questionnaire as regards truthfulness in speech indicated that their collegiate existence was registering some improvement; yet there seems to have been effected some curious warp and woof of the collegian's conscience by which he condones deception in examinations. About thirty-seven per cent indicated that while in college they had overcome partly habits of lying, about twelve per cent thought contrariwise, and the remainder revealed a tender regard for the truth, especially where intimate social contacts compelled it.

Now college examinations are very directly concerned with honesty and truth since they demand honest interpretations of one's own worth. What then are the facts in this regard? Let me preface my remarks with this caution—that the two studies on which these observations are based do not give sufficient grounds for generalization. They serve rather as indications. The first basis is a study conducted by the writer by means of a questionnaire anonymously returned and in which all collegiate and personal identity was lost. It may be sufficient in extension to justify some general conclusions, but the inexactitude of the method precludes such. The second study, reported by Professor Fenton of Ohio University,[1] is unquestionably exacting in attainment of facts but insufficient in extent to warrant generalization.

[1] *School and Society*, 10 Sept., 1927.

For the evidence of my study in this regard three hundred questionnaires were selected from different college groups. It is important to note that in securing this information every precaution was taken to assure the student that he would not incriminate himself and high religious and social motives were proposed to elicit from him reliable testimony.

Sixty-five per cent of the students stated that while in college at one time or other they used dishonest methods in examination. Professor Fenton's report revealed that sixty-three per cent in the group studied were actually dishonest. Of the group of three hundred, sixty-one, or a mere one-fifth, had not cheated in examination at one time or other in their scholastic career.

The great majority of students who enter college have been initiated into dishonest practices in high school classes—to be exact, one hundred and sixty out of the three hundred. The number of those who stated that they had never cheated in high school but had done so in college was fifty-seven. To my great surprise, the period of transition for many of these was not the freshmen but the junior year.

The majority of the students who were consistently honest in high school were such in college—ninty-four out of one hundred and fifty-one. The point is of great interest because of a similar indication in Professor Fenton's report.

As one cannot weigh mathematically vice or virtue, so we cannot by figures accurately determine the transition to honesty or dishonesty among college men in this regard. There were eighty-eight students of the three hundred who noted an improvement, sometimes great and sometimes small. This is more than offset by the fact that fifty-seven who in high school were always honest in examinations in college adopted other procedure.

To secure an indication of an angle for reconstruction of collegiate honor in this regard, a further question was asked, "What impelled you most toward improvement, if any is noted?" Twenty-two stated "moral or religious instruction"; fourteen, fear of disapproval of fellow students; thirteen, stricter discipline in class; nine, better preparation; nine, more effective teaching; and the remaining few noted "inability to cheat" as the prime motive of their conversion toward honest practice.

There is such a strong tendency toward self-exculpation among those who changed from honest to dishonest practice while in college that one questions whether these responses came from men of average mentality. Only three of four were responsible (sic) for their action and saw in this dishonesty a wholly personal fault. The main cause of this dishonesty was alleged to be "poor teachers": however, there were also some "poor students" (who believed in cheating in the examination) and the contagion of their bad example was held as the contributing cause of the dishonesty of the remainder of the retrogrades.

Summarizing briefly my own impressions from these student testimonies (and again I suggest that this evidence is inconclusive), they are:

1. The majority of these students do not relate their conduct in examinations to the judgment of conscience as, for instance, they relate deception of other types.

2. The student who is honest in high school examinations is most apt to be honest in college.

3. The practice of dishonesty in examination and its moral implications demand exhaustive study and mature deliberation.

III.

The report of Professor Fenton, while I believe the method suggested is open to criticism in certain points, cannot be attacked because of inaccuracy of fact. Three students, to whom this study was assigned as an essay topic, were strategically placed in a class of thirty-two where they might observe their fellow students without the latter being aware of such observation. The investigation was conducted in three different settings.

In the first investigation the instructor sat in the front of the room and read a book, glancing about but little during the examination. In this situation ten out of thirty-two cheated. "Cheating" is here used to signify using notes, requesting information, or copying from another paper.

In the second situation the professor remained in his office out of sight, but where he might return at any moment. Here twelve cheated. In the third situation the professor

withdrew from the class room, walking across the campus where the students might see his departure. He spoke of the fact that as college students, many of them intending to be teachers, he believed they could be trusted and placed upon their honor, but he exacted no promises from them. In this situation fourteen cheated.

In the three different situations sixty-three per cent of the students actually cheated. There seems also among this group to have been some divergence between theory and practice. In answering to the question, "Do you think students are incapable of being trained to be honest in examination and that therefore the honor system is an impossible ideal?" twenty-seven responded negatively and five affirmatively. Yet the injection of the appeal to honor seems to have been very unhappy in its consequences.

One detail in this study I think is deserving of special comment. It is this—of the five students in the class who were consistently honest, four had been trained under honor systems in high school. I have no intention here of digressing into the intricacies of the honor system. I believe that its service is contingent upon many conditions, not the least of which is the type of examination. Where the test demands much memory work, a maximum of surveillance would be advisable: where it demands more original thought and application, less surveillance would be required. Psychological tests in which the professor matches his ingenuity against that of the student to trick the student into revealing his ignorance, will undoubtedly be matched in part by the ingenuity of the student in evading such revelation. Such facts as Professor Fenton suggests in regard to the appeal to honor are thought-provoking. It would appear that a cursory comment at the beginning of the examination is inadequate to insure honesty.

There is another point in Professor Fenton's survey that has a direct bearing upon the facts from my own survey. After the study, he gained some information as to the student thought in an anonymous class paper. Among the questions asked was this, "Have you ever cheated in an examination?" Twenty-one replied in the affirmative and ten in the negative. The significant point is this—by a hidden identification mark seven of the ten negative answers were identified and four

of these students had actually cheated in the examination in question. The obvious implication is that the facts I have gathered are worthless. However, it is my persuasion that because I gave my questionnaire to students with whom I had no official contacts, with every assurance of protection, and with an appeal based upon high motives, the student voice was very reliable. Then too the students included in the second study may have suspected a trick somewhere and the suspicion might have affected their response. The later observation is borne out by the fact that seemingly their confidence was abused.

IV.

One's reactions to these statistics are by no means pleasant, but if I have isolated them from their proper perspective I have been guilty of making a mountain out of a molehill. At any rate I trust that I have not given the impression that the majority of students maintain their academic standard by cheating, because quite the contrary is true. The effort involved in this procedure is largely wasted. Many students sensed this situation and gave the inefficacy of cheating as a cause for discontinuing the practice. In response to my question, "Did cheating affect your class rating materially?" the student voice was practically unanimous in the negative. In Professor Fenton's report it is important to note the following:

Grade Received	*Percentage Cheating*
A	0
B	33%
C	80%
D or O	75%

However, to infer from these statistics that cheating in examinations had no direct and noteworthy effect would be a big assumption. There is a direct and serious consequence upon the character of the student cheating. Emerson notes in his essay, "Self Reliance", "A man is relieved and gay when he has put his heart into his work and done his best, but what he has said or done otherwise shall give him no peace." With that idea in the background I inserted this question in

the survey, "Has your dishonesty affected your self-respect?" The answer was vehemently in the affirmative.

V.

The facts which I have attempted to expose with as much accuracy as possible present a twofold problem. One aspect concerns the educator in its technical phase; the other demands the mature deliberation of spiritual advisers. It would be easy to volunteer to the former the suggestion that the examination be eliminated entirely as a regular method of class procedure. Such a suggestion would not be very popularly received unless accompanied by another specifying a substitute whereby a professor might ascertain the student's grasp of a subject. On the other hand the educational expert might volunteer to spiritual guides and religion professors the answer that this was their problem—to adjust the student conscience properly in regard to such dishonesty. Certainly the latter thought is far less radical than the former.

How then might this be accomplished? I may have given the impression that there exists on the campus evidently a double standard remnant—one code of honesty toward professors in classes and another toward other campus associates. One of the biggest jobs Christianity undertook in its earlier stages was to effect a head-on collision with the double standard in more serious interpretations. It did its work very efficiently in most fields. Here Christian motives should not be less effective. The collegian who is accustomed to gauge his action by the question. "Would Christ in my position act thus?" will have no difficulty in seeing the incongruity of exemplifying honesty in many regards but evading its inconvenience in one particular.

Is it necessary to appeal to supernatural motives in a case of this kind? The Scriptural answer, "That is not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural, afterward that which is spiritual," would suggest the advisability of building on natural foundations a motivation that would correct such defects as dishonesty in examination. I have suggested the inefficacy of cheating as a corrective thought, but I question whether it is very powerful. Yet the beautiful symmetry of a life in comformity to truth in all details is no insignificant

thought. There should come a time in every young man's education when, if he is being truly educated, he must realize that ignorance is not the capital sin of studentship; that imitation is in a sense intellectual suicide; that he must no longer deceive himself and, *a fortiori,* his professors, if he is to be in any sense of the term a *true student.*

Sometimes young men in college who give promise of great achievements, and who are educated to supernatural interpretation of life, apparently have the same fate as the house built upon sands. One then is apt to question whether we have not neglected the thought that "virtue" without "vir" means little, and that we have not Christian manhood simply because we have not manhood—the essential basis upon which Christlike characters are based. And yet a neglect of the supernatural motives for action, to those habituated to them, even in such a detail of college life as I suggest, might be dangerous. Until we are sure that we have proposed efficiently supernatural motives for action, we should not go to the extremes of naturalism in answering the problem (which is still more or less of a riddle), "What is wrong with character training in the colleges?" It is rather absurd, however, to expect honesty among college men until we have established the fact of honesty among college professors; and until we of the latter class bravely face the facts of student dishonesty we are open to suspicion in regard to our own sincerity. Such honest study and prayerful concern must be the initial step toward the solution of any such problem among those young men who should be the living exemplars of the Young Man of Galilee.

MAURICE S. SHEEHY.

Catholic University of America.

THE "PERVERTED FACULTY" ARGUMENT AGAINST BIRTH PREVENTION.

THE purpose of the present article is to examine a little more closely the ethical argument against birth prevention drawn from the misuse of a faculty. It is evident to anyone, who comes into close contact with this modern vice, that the only adequate reason refraining Catholics from the practice of birth prevention is the conviction that it is a grave sin against God. The faithful in general, and we thank God for it, accept the definite teaching of the Church that such actions are sinful, and do not exercise their minds unduly in discovering the ethical reasons for this judgment. In spite of the attempts of some modern philosophies to construct an ethical system quite independent of God, it is true to say that the average person still regulates his moral conduct on a principle of religion. A Catholic does more: he regulates his actions on a principle of *authoritative* religious teaching, believing that the Church is infallible in defining morals as well as faith. This is not a blind docility which calls for an apology. St. Thomas, in the first article of the *Summa,* wisely insists that we need to be taught by God even truths which unaided reason is capable of discovering, since, without this assistance, the truth will only be discovered "a paucis, et per longum tempus et cum admixtione multorum errorum".[1]

But in our dealings with non-Catholics, and very often in dissuading our own people from onanistic vice, it is frequently necessary to offer some reasons for this authoritative teaching of the Church. For birth prevention is wrong, not merely because it is forbidden by the Church, but because it is against the moral law binding all mankind. It is forbidden because it is already wrong, with an initial fundamental wrongness which is antecedent to any ecclesiastical law.

In demonstrating its moral wrongness the easiest and most popular method is to dwell on its evil effects, whether on the individual, or on the family, or on the race. This is a strong and valid line of approach, but to many people it is not absolutely conclusive. A lurid summary of the consequent physical ills, especially to the woman, will not carry much weight

[1] Cf. Bouquillon, *Theologia Moralis Fundamentalis,* § 76.

in cases where pregnancy is attended by dangerous illness. The happy vision of a radiant family of healthy children is more than counterbalanced by the squalid picture of a family underfed and ill-housed. And it seems unlikely that people will be restrained from this sin on motives of patriotism alone. Still less can we regard the motive of the agent as being the chief element in discerning the morality of an action. The moral teaching of the Church, and in fact any sound ethical system, must stand committed to the doctrine that an action which is evil cannot be tolerated, no matter what the circumstances may be, and no matter what the intention of the agent is. Anything short of a rigid and logical application of this rule opens the way to the patently immoral doctrine that the end justifies the means. Our chief concern, therefore, in trying to show the inherent rightness of the attitude of the Church on this matter, should be to explain why the practice is wrong, quite apart from the motive, and quite apart from its subsequent effects and repercussions on the individual and on society.

I.

It is rather a matter of regret that the manuals of moral theology, as well as the average type of propaganda directed against birth prevention, give far too little attention to the intrinsic wrongness of the action. Many of the advocates of birth prevention are actuated by good and sincere motives: they wish to benefit the individual and the race by restricting the birth of children in certain cases. When they ask why the practice is regarded by the Church as intrinsically wrong, they are sometimes told—what is, in effect, fairly obvious—that the reason is because nature's purpose is frustrated by a deliberate interference with the natural act of generation; it it wrong because unnatural. Now, when expressed in this manner, powerful though the argument may be to a person already persuaded by education and conviction of the wrongness of birth prevention, it does certainly appear a somewhat vulnerable proof. If we try, for the sake of discussion, to adopt the mentality of an honest exponent of birth-preventive methods, all sorts of objections could be formulated. Shaving one's beard is an interference with nature; snuff-taking is an

unnatural use to make of the nose; medicines and surgical operations are all interferences with natural forces of the body. It would be answered that these objections are frivolous, and that the Catholic moralist applies the word " unnatural ", when speaking of birth prevention, in the sense that certain unmentionable vices are spoken of as unnatural. Even so, it does make one reflect very seriously on the way this argument is commonly presented, when we find that the Committee appointed in England by the National Council of Public Morals, a body which collected evidence from a number of earnest and intelligent people in various learned professions, find it necessary to say in their report that they do not feel able to condemn contraceptives on the ground of their being " unnatural ", for civilization itself has been the story of man's control over nature mainly by mechanical means.[2] This very trite objection turns, of course, on an equivocal use of the word " unnatural ".

When a moralist, no matter what his school of thought, speaks of a thing as bad or wrong, he means the words to be used in a *moral* not in a *physical* sense. The two may often coincide, but complete confusion will arise unless we distinguish the " formal " from the " material " element in human actions.[3] Physical or ontological evil may be the matter of these actions, just as marble is the material on which a sculptor works, but the form—the element which characterizes an action as ethically good or bad—is something added over and above the existing physical good or evil. What this element precisely is the philosophers discuss, but clearly we must insist throughout that moral evil is not necessarily physical evil. In exactly the same way the word " unnatural " is capable of two meanings. No sane person would ever say that it was anything else but physically natural that Onan's action resulted in preventing the birth of a child to his brother's wife; it is obviously natural that the use of contrivances of various sorts should prevent the fecundation of the ovum—it would be unnatural if they did not. But, over and above the " natural "

[2] *The Ethics of Birth Control.* Macmillan, 1925; page 20. A commentary on this report has been made by the Rev. Henry Davis, S.J.: *Birth Control Ethics;* Burns, Oates & Washbourne, 1927.

[3] Cf. Ed. Janssens, *Cours de Morale Générale,* Vol. I, p. 166.

or the "unnatural", in the physical sense, is an added relation of disorder, by which the moralist speaks of human actions being unnatural i. e., as out of harmony with the nature and dignity of a human being. It is, I think, worth while remarking that occasionally the popular arguments, often used in dissuading people from the practice of birth prevention, lend some support to this lamentable confusion of thought, by dwelling too fondly on the physical evils attendant on the use of contraceptives, and by stressing unduly the purely physiological sense of "unnatural", just as though *lex naturalis* were synonymous with animal instinct or behavior. For what is natural for one animal may be unnatural for another, and what is perfectly natural for every animal may be highly unnatural in a human being endowed with reason. "Sic igitur sub Deo legislatore diversae creaturae diversas habent naturales inclinationes: ita ut quod uni est quodammodo lex, alteri sit contra legem: ut si dicam quod furibundum esse est quodammodo lex canis, est autem contra legem ovis, vel alterius mansueti animalis." [4] "Natura hominis potest dici vel illa quae est propria hominis; et secundum hoc omnia peccata, inquantum sunt contra rationem, sunt etiam contra naturam . . . vel illa quae est communis homini et aliis animalibus; et secundum hoc quaedam specialia peccata dicuntur contra naturam sicut . . . concubitus masculorum." [5]

Provided the terms are carefully defined, it is, of course, quite accurate to speak of birth prevention as "unnatural" in the physiological sense of the word, but we can hardly be surprised, I suppose, if the moderate advocate of birth-preventive measures declines to appreciate the point of view. But, as a matter of fact, we shall get closer to the final and ultimate reason against birth prevention, if we give our attention chiefly to the strictly ethical sense of the word "unnatural" i. e., as denoting something opposed to the nature of a rational creature, for it is in this unique sense that our ethical arguments turn when establishing other human obligations. For if, in trying to dissuade a person from this vice, we are obsessed with the animal sense of "unnatural", we might easily be drawn out of our depth by being reminded

[4] Summa I–II, q. 91, art. 6.

[5] Ibid., q. 94, art. 3, ad 2.

that even the grossest homosexual tendencies can be observed in animals. And if, as is commonly the case, the advocate of birth prevention declines to see any resemblance to unnatural vice in the use of contraceptives, the discussion will reach a condition of stalemate, in which one party insists that it is opposed to human nature to misuse a faculty, and the other party insists that it is eminently human to control nature by intelligent means.

Moreover, in meeting an opponent who is familiar with our theological authors, we are likely to be faced with a rather serious difficulty. In all the popular presentations of the "perverted faculty" argument an analogy is commonly given with the malice of lying. Following the Augustinian definition of a lie as "locutio contra mentem", the malice of it is commonly held to consist in a perversion of the faculty of speech. Speech is for the purpose of revealing what is in the mind; a lie perverts that faculty by expressing something contrary to what is in the mind. Now, every theologian knows that there exists in Catholic schools a theory of lying which departs from this traditional view, and places the malice of a lie rather in the injustice done to another than in the perversion of the faculty of speech. With the details of this dispute we are not now concerned,[6] except to notice that it is a little imprudent to use this analogy in support of the perverted faculty argument against birth prevention. What is to prevent our opponent from expressing the hope that Catholic theologians will similarly find themeslves able to depart from it in circumstances where there is a just and reasonable cause for preventing the birth of children. Let the popular "perverted faculty" argument remain by all means. It is one which is readily understood and it contains all the elements of truth, provided it is taken in subservience to the strictly ethical sense of "unnatural". However, if we are to understand the full and accurate implication of "unnatural" as applied to contraceptives, in a manner which will enable us to perceive the answer to the many difficulties and objections constantly arising, we must recall—at least in general terms—the essential concepts upon which ethical thinking is based.

[6] Cf. *Irish Theological Record*, Vol. XVIII, pp. 267-602; Vermeersch, *Gregorianum*, Vol. I, pp. 12, 425; Tanquerey, *Theol. Moralis*, III, § 410.

II.

We must, at the outset, unless the discussion is stretched to unwieldy limits, take two things for granted. In the first place it must be conceded that, in dealing with a human being, we are discussing a nature which, unlike animals and material things, is *rational* and endowed with freedom. We must not think of this essential difference between men and animals as though it were some added perfection to an existing perfect human being, as though we could consider such a being as an individual of the human species without the formal aspect of rationality. A man is specifically a man not because he shares certain animal functions with non-rational creatures, but because his nature is rational. In the second place we must concede the existence of God, for though it would be possible to demonstrate that certain actions are evil, solely on the data of human nature, yet, it is not possible to demonstrate fully the obligation to avoid those evils unless we recognize the existence of a Creator who, in making human nature, fixed to it certain tendencies and laws inclining men to their natural end and perfection. People who deny the existence and immortality of the soul, and its relation to God as its last end, must necessarily rule their conduct on a hedonist principle of individual pleasure, or, at the best, on a utilitarian basis which makes social well-being the sole test of the rightness of human actions.[7] It would seem, in the long run, better for Catholic writers to demonstrate the wrongness of birth prevention by showing the essential inadequacy of ethical systems opposed to the teaching of Catholic philosophy, rather than merely to condemn the practice as "unnatural", especially when the word is capable of so many different meanings.

The sum total of the tendencies, needs and desires of any being toward its proper end or perfection is, in fact, the nature of that being. A definite nature has activities corresponding to it. A human being, owing to the complexity of his nature, enjoys many activities corresponding to his various faculties and desires. Because he is partly an animal he has the need of food to support the individual; because he is a

[7] The influence of utilitarian principles in this matter is self-evident. Cf. Stopes, *Contraception*, pp. 278, 307; also a letter of John Stuart Mill, p. 291, edition 1923.

social being he has a natural tendency toward those goods without which social life would be impossible.[8] But man is man precisely and formally because he is rational, and it is under this aspect of what is fitting for man as a rational creature that we are to determine that certain natural physical goods, appealing to one side of his nature, are in reality unnatural for him considered as a human being.[9] He uses material things like food and drink; he controls and administers his own bodily members; he has definite relations toward lower creatures, and toward his fellow men; but before any of these things can be called "good" for him as a man, his use of them must be directed in a manner which is in accordance with his rational nature. We have used for centuries the term "bonum honestum" to specify the good toward which rational human nature, as such, has a natural tendency. It is something desired for its own sake as being the only adequate object of the tendencies of a rational nature, and is distinguished from "bonum delectabile" i. e., the good which satisfies the animal and sensitive part of our nature.[10] Unrestrained and unlimited enjoyment of the pleasure of the senses may be a perfectly natural desire on the part of a creature devoid of reason, but, once granted that "rationality" is the distinctive characteristic of human nature, which is endowed with a tendency toward a higher good than sense pleasure, then it must follow that sensitive pleasure, as such, is not the natural object of human tendencies, and to act as though it were is simply unnatural in a human being.

Nor are we driven, by this doctrine, to the other extreme of regarding the tendency toward the sensitive good of the animal part of our nature as morally bad. It merely follows that the gratification of sensible pleasure must, in a human being, be regulated by reason. For, since a man has a human body with sensible needs and tendencies, the pleasure experienced from the satisfaction of these desires, if indulged in reasonably and in a manner consistent with the dignity of a rational nature, shares from this regulation in the character of "bonum honestum".[11]

[8] Cf. *Contra Gentes,* III, C. 129.

[9] Cf. I–II, Q. 71, art. 2.

[10] Cf. Cathrein, *Philosophia Moralis,* § 110; Frins, *De Actibus Humanis,* II, §§ 108, 129.

[11] Cathrein, ibid., § 161.

When, therefore, we say that an action is morally wrong, we mean chiefly it is unbecoming a rational nature and is consequently unnatural i. e. in the strict ethical sense. In order to avoid a completely false idea of natural morals it is important that this aspect should always be kept in the foreground. Provided the wrongness of an action, as being opposed to the natural or moral law of human nature, is understood, we can in many cases substantiate or elaborate the argument by showing that a given action is also unnatural in other senses of the word. Thus, suicide is wrong because it is an invasion of the rights of God, violating the right order of our dependence on Him who gave us life, and who alone can take it away; there is an added wrongness from the fact that every substance naturally tends to preserve it own existence; man, in using his faculties to destroy himself, is acting contrary to this law. The same distinction is specially true in the whole matter of chastity. Venereal pleasure apart from the lawful use of marriage is opposed to man's rational nature: "quod quidem potest esse dupliciter: uno modo quia repugnat rationi rectae, quod est commune in omni vitio luxuriae; alio modo, quia etiam *super hoc* repugnat ipsi ordini naturali venerei actus, qui convenit humanae speciei, quod dicitur vitium contra naturam".[12] In this text St. Thomas is concerned with showing that "vitium contra naturam" is a distinct species of sexual impurity (*luxuria*). All *luxuria* is bad for a rational nature and therefore unnatural in the strict ethical sense; the additional unnaturalness, in the physiological sense, is an added circumstance making the act more gravely immoral, more perverted, more unnatural—in fact, a distinct species of the genus *luxuria.*

III.

Now, the point of view I am anxious to stress is this. The argument drawn from the unnatural use of the faculty of generation should be used with a proper sense of proportion, and kept in its proper place, as an indication that the use of contraceptives constitutes a distinct species of sexual vice. It seems to me that the argument, as popularly presented, has slipped out of its proper place, and is being used to exhibit

[12] II–IIae, Q. 154, art. 11.

the sole reason why the use of contraceptives is to be considered a grave sexual offence. The misuse of a faculty is indeed the specific reason indicating how this sin differs from other sexual sins, but the ultimate reason why birth prevention is a sin of the genus *impurity* is the reason "commune in omni vitio luxuriae", namely, because it is utterly opposed to the good of a rational nature to act in this way. The argument drawn from the unnatural use of a faculty is valid and accurate provided that it is taken in subservience to the ethical sense of " unnatural ".

I am not saying that our task, in persuading people of the wrongness of contraception, will be any easier. But, I imagine, there are many thinking people who have some difficulty in perceiving the enormity of misusing a faculty, but who, if the point were adequately explained, would at least see that the Church condemns this practice for generically the same reason that fornication or masturbation is condemned and regarded universally as sexual vice.

There is no need, for the purposes of this article, to expound fully the reasons underlying this condemnation. They are dealt with in the early sections of any treatise " De Sexto Precepto " in establishing that, apart from the lawful use of marriage, all venereal delectation which is directly voluntary is forbidden by the natural law and is gravely sinful, no matter what the species of sin may be. " Omnis talis actus (i. e. usus genitalium membrorum praeter matrimonialem actum) est inordinatus secundum seipsum . . . ex hoc quod omnis actus humanus dicitur esse inordinatus qui non est proportionatus debito fini; sicut comestio est inordinata, si non proportionetur corporis salubritati, ad quam ordinatur sicut ad finem. Finis autem usus genitalium membrorum est generatio et educatio prolis; et ideo omnis usus praedictorum membrorum qui non est proportionatus generationi et educationi prolis, est secundum se inordinatus." [13] Why " inordinatus " and " disproportionatus " ? Because the sexual pleasure is attached to these actions in order to attract people to perform this necessary social office. The sensible pleasure which is attached to an action, as a means to an end, is not an adequate and proportionate object of human appetition, in itself and apart

[13] De Malo, Q. XV, art. i, corpus: Parma Opera VIII, p. 382.

from the purpose to which it is attached: "quia homo inter cetera animalia rationem finis cognoscit, et proportionem operis ad finem: ideo naturalis conceptio ei indita, qua dirigatur ad operandum convenienter, lex naturalis vel jus naturale dicitur. . . . Bruta enim ex vi naturae impelluntur ad operandum convenientes actiones magis quam regulantur quasi proprio arbitrio agentia. Lex ergo naturalis nihil est aliud quam conceptio homini naturaliter indita, qua dirigitur ad agendum in actionibus propriis, sive competant ei ex natura generis, ut generare, comedere, et huiusmodi; sive ex natura speciei, ut ratiocinari, et similia. Omne autem illud quod actionem inconvenientem reddit fini quem natura ex opere aliquo intendit, contra legem naturae esse dicitur." [14]

It was for this reason that the two propositions were condemned, which taught that there was no sin in eating for pleasure and in exercising marriage rights for pleasure.[15] The doctrine has led some theologians to adopt a quite needless severity in forbidding the proper and natural exercise of these rights, when sought solely for pleasure. As a matter of fact, among married people, there can always be shown to exist some proportionate reason which excuses the action from being sought "propter solam voluptatem".[16] The condemned proposition has in view, of course, the natural exercise of conjugal rights. Clearly, in the case where the natural purpose and "finis" of the action is intercepted, the action stands out as preëminently done for the sexual pleasure, sought for its own sake, and detached from its accompanying natural purpose.

We cannot do more than notice, very compendiously and summarily, some of the objections which could be brought against this doctrine. In the first place, even granted the difference arising from the fact that man has a rational nature, many have a difficulty in understanding why there should be this ban on the seeking of sexual pleasure, as such. For, after all, it is only one of many kinds of sensible pleasure which the animal part of our nature enjoys. Are we going to say that

[14] IV Sent. Dist. xxxiii, Q. 1, art. 1; Parma Opera VII, p. 967.

[15] Cf. Denzinger, 1158, 1159.

[16] Cf. the sound and common-sense treatment of this subject by Ballerini, *Opus Morale*, VI, §§ 431-451, 551-592.

the bodily delight of bathing in a cool stream in summer, or of sitting before a glowing fire in winter, is wrong; or that it is unbecoming a rational creature to enjoy the scent of flowers and the manifold attractions of nature? For all these are sensible pleasures and they are commonly sought for their own sake and apart from any ulterior purpose. The solution of this difficulty turns, of course, on the fact that there are many kinds of sensible pleasure which have no other conceivable purpose except causing pleasurable feelings: this is in fact their sole nature and end, as far as human use of them is concerned. The use of such pleasures, as pleasures, is becoming and fitting for human nature, provided a proper moderation is observed, for they serve as recreation and relaxation. But it is altogether different with those pleasures which are attached to some other necessary function and purpose, as a means to an end; of this kind are the pleasures attached to eating, and most of all the pleasure attached to the use of the generative functions. The pleasure, in these cases, cannot be, for a rational human creature, an end in itself apart from the function to which it is attached. "Verum quidem est, quod possit propter se intendi directe oblectatio aliqua v. g. in olfactu floris . . . quia huiusmodi voluptas ad hoc ipsum instituta est a natura, ut animum relaxat. At voluptas in cibo, potu, et venereis, non est ad id instituta, sed ut per comestionem consulamus conservationi individui, et per actum conjugalem conservationi speciei; unde inverteretur naturae ordo, si huiusmodi delectationes directe et ratione sui intenderentur." [17]

A further objection arises from rather a similar angle. It is a favorite point with advocates of birth prevention to stress, in justification of the use of contraceptives, what the theologians speak of as the secondary ends of marriage: "remedium concupiscentiae," "ad fovendum mutuum amorem". They instinctively take up this attitude and speak of the use of marriage being a most sublime expression of human love, in order to rescue contraceptive methods from being a mere incitement to excessive venereal pleasure. Many of them, in fact, make this expression of love the primary purpose of the action. Quite unwittingly they are thus supporting our ethical doctrine which requires some "bonum honestum" in seek-

[17] Viva: *In Prop. Damnatas,* p. 205; edition 1723.

ing sexual pleasure. The objection is an easy one to meet. Expression of love is not the primary purpose of the action, taken objectively; it may be, of course, the primary intention of the agent. The action in itself is clearly designed of its nature primarily to procreate children. In every case where the purposes of an action can be dissected into "primary" and "secondary", it is taken for granted that the primary purpose is not defeated. In fact, in most cases, the secondary purpose is so closely connected with the primary purpose that it cannot be attained without it. (We are discussing the matter objectively, of course, not from the point of view of the agent's intention.) Thus, receiving a stipend may be a lawful secondary purpose in a priest saying Mass; but he cannot receive the stipend unless he says Mass, the primary purpose of which is the glory of God. Or take the more apposite action of eating food. The primary purpose is the support of the individual body, a secondary purpose might easily be social conviviality. Would any sane person so separate the two ends or purposes of this action as to maintain that gluttony, which perverts the primary purpose of the act, is quite justifiable when eating has for its object the social amenities of life?

Other objections turn on the equivocal uses of the word "unnatural", which we have been examining throughout this discussion. It is often pointed out triumphantly that the use of marriage during the "tempus ageneseos", a practice allowed by the Church, and recommended by religious bodies generally, must be morally wrong because it is unnatural for a woman to desire the debt to be rendered at this time.[18] Unnatural is here used in the sense of unpleasurable, distasteful, or even painful. But in the ethical sense it is supremely natural for a human being to render a contracted debt of justice, even if it is distasteful. It is also an expression of the virtue of charity to forestall the possible sin of another, at the cost of some self-sacrifice.

Finally there is the class of objection, which applies in some degree to the "tempus ageneseos"; i. e. does it not follow that the use of marriage should be forbidden to those who are sterile through age or infirmity, since the procreation of children is impossible? Obviously not. The moralist considers

[18] Cf. Stopes, *Contraception*, p. 235.

a human action as such. If in the course of nature, and for natural reasons (nature being taken here in the physiological sense), conception does not follow the use of marriage, it is not his particular concern. The action in question, it is supposed, is fitted of its nature for the generation of children, and even when this cannot take place, there is still the secondary purposes of the action justifying it as " bonum honestum ". Otherwise we should have to forbid the use of marriage from the moment of conception.

Fortunately, the Christian conscience perceives without much difficulty the rather intangible thing which the philosopher describes as " bonum honestum ", and equally perceives the sinfulness of actions which secure sexual pleasure while frustrating the purpose of the faculty. With the growth of irreligion and indifference, in an age which lives only for pleasure, it is not a matter of surprise to find that people reject, almost unconsciously, the basis of Christian ethics. The evil can be met only by restoring again these principles, and by reminding the faithful that in professing to follow Christ they are following One whose life was the very antithesis of pleasure-seeking.

E. J. MAHONEY.

Old Hall, Ware, England.

MODERN PSYCHOLOGY AND THE BOY.

I.

IT is a remarkable fact that the human child is one of the last things to come within the ken of science. The astronomer with his telescope has searched the sky and discovered stars at untold distances; the geologist has read in rocks the story of an unthinkably remote past; the biologist with his microscope has examined the infinitesimal life of the Protozoa; but only very recently has there been any scientific knowledge of childhood. Man himself, the most obvious subject of study, has been one of the last to be studied. It is literally true that until within a very few years scientists knew more about the teeth of dinosaurs than they did about the play habits of three-year-old children, more about the Triassic age, than the age of dramatic play.

This has been an unfortunate state of affairs. The boy is father to the man, and we can only understand adults when we approach the problem genetically and study mind in the making, learning our lessons from the child. The importance of child study extends over the entire field of social sciences. We are concerned here, however, about its importance for the recreational leader. Evidently it is not possible to gain the interest of the child and to influence him in wholesome ways unless we first understand something about him. For this reason the recreational worker ought to be very much interested in the modern child-study movement.

The remarkable recent growth of the child psychology has been due to a complex series of causes but we can single out three movements which have been of outstanding importance in their contribution to the understanding of the normal development of the child. The first of these is the nursery school. These institutions have long been familiar in Europe. The German *Kindergarten* is really a form of nursery school; and the work of Margaret and Rachel McMillan has long made such institutions familar in England. But when the nursery school was introduced into the United States it was with a very special purpose. The emphasis was on the study of the preschool child through the methods of modern psychological research. The result is that there are some 75 centers in the United States attended by children from two to five years of age, who are being scientifically studied by competent and trained psychologists. The fruit of this research has been an immensely increased understanding of the preschool child and through it, of the later periods of childhood as well.

A second contribution has come from the educational psychologists. Twenty-five years ago educational psychology was a very formal science which had little to contribute to the understanding of childhood. With the rise of the test movement, however, educators came into possession of an instrument through which really exact methods were first introduced into education. The development of intelligence tests has given a new impetus to the understanding of the child.

Probably the most outstanding factor in the advance of modern child psychology has been the contribution of the psychiatric clinic. Throughout the country scores of these

clinics are in operation. Problem children are brought to them by their parents, by the schools, by social workers, or by juvenile courts. There they are studied intensively from all angles. Physicians make physical examinations; psychologist administer tests; social workers study home conditions; the psychiatrist uses the newly acquired technique of his science to make a personality study of the child. The results have been that we are beginning to gain an insight into the causes which make the queer and reserved child differ so much form his fellows.

It is unfortunate that there is no book which sums up, in a satisfactory way, this newer knowledge of childhood. In the bibliography at the end of this chapter are a number of references to books on various special topics, but unfortunately most of the contributions of modern child psychologists remain scattered through the pages of scientific periodicals and monographs.

II.

There is nothing in nature more wonderful than the growth of a child. At birth he is pathetically helpless, more so perhaps than any of the young of any other animal. His entire psychical equipment is limited to a few reflexes. Eighteen or twenty years later he is an individual with a developed intellect which places him infinitely above the brute creation. The changes during these years are not merely quantitative but qualitative. It is a very common error of adults to look upon the child as merely a " little man ". Nothing could be further from the truth. The child is not merely an abridged edition of the adult. He is, as Terman says, " different from the adult in every fibre, every blood corpuscle, every bone cell, and in the relative proportion of all his parts ". If a new born infant could be magnified to the size of a grown man he would be a monster with an enormous head and short undeveloped legs. The physical differences between the adult and the infant are therefore not merely differences of size; and what is true of the body is true of the mind as well. The boy is not merely less intelligent than the adult, he is intelligent in a different way. He is not merely more emotional, his emotions are different ones. The progress from boyhood to ma-

turity is not a straight and orderly one. It is a strange psychological journey leading into many unexpected detours and emerging from them just as abruptly. It is necessary, therefore, to recognize the existence of periods of growth, periods which are really different from each other. The exact number and extent of these may be hard to determine, but at least for convenience in exposition we must recognize their existence.

The infant under one year of age is a separate problem. Most of his waking time is taken up with appears to the adult to be random movements. His head, his eyes, his legs, are in constant motion, quite uncoordinated at first but quickly gaining in control with the passage of the months. These random movements of the baby have the characteristics of play. At least they are activities carried on for their own sake without any ulterior motive, and this is the essence of play. But although the motor play of the infant may be pure fun from his standpoint, from the standpoint of Nature it is tremendously important. For it is only through these apparently random movements that the child learns to control and coordinate his movements. Thus man becomes, as has been well said, a "play-built animal".

The infant learns to walk and talk soon after his first birthday. He then enters upon a new and distinct stage of his existence, generally called the *pre-school period*. He still retains something of the old liking for mere activity, but this is no longer enough to satisfy his aspirations. The play of the preschool child is complex. Here it will be enough to mention his most characteristic activity—dramatic play. By this, of course, is not meant playing theater but any sort of activity in which the imagination supplies for the lack of reality. The tiny girl with her doll which her imagination endows with speech and feeling, the tiny boy with the wagon which becomes successively a fire-engine, a locomotive, and a pirate ship—these are typical examples of the dramatic play of this period. What all this means, we adults do not exactly know. Psychologists have not yet plucked out the heart of the secret. Perhaps Joseph Lee was right when he said that it was the child's way of exploring realities. It is not enough for him to look at a locomotive or a fire-engine. He has to get inside

a thing and be it; he has to become a locomotive to see what it feels like to roar down the shining rails with a cloud of smoke in his wake.

Around the age of six an event of tremendous importance takes place in the life of the average child. He goes to school. Before this he has been a solitary being, a little outcast somewhat misunderstood in a world of older brothers and sisters. Now for the first time he meets a large number of others in the same plight as himself. It is the child's introduction to society. Now for the first time he begins to measure himself with other lads. He fights with Johnny Jones not so much because he bears him any animosity, as because he wants to satisfy his own curiosity as to whether Johnny can fight as well as he. He runs a race with Billie Smith not so much for the glory of victory as to measure the swiftness of his own pair of legs. Team games interest him not at all. Individual competition is the breath of his life. *Extremum capiat rabies.* The psychology of the six-year-old is epitomized in the game of tag.

At this stage it is useless for recreational leaders to try to interest a boy in organized team games. In fact he needs very little direction. Coaches, uniforms, and athletic teams are beyond his horizon. The principal form of organized recreation for this age is the playground. As far as the writer knows, there has been only one elaborately worked-out club program for boys of this age; namely the *American Eagles* (13) of the Horace Mann school, at Columbia University. It was successful simply because Smith and Fretwell, its organizers, were geniuses.

III.

Somewhat around ten to twelve certain remarkable changes take place in a boy and a new era has begun. Up to this time he was willing to admit girls as participants in his games. His little sister was his companion in his activities and they were not above a few friendly battles in which chivalry was quite forgotten. But now a striking change has taken place. It is the ultimate in insults to ask him to play with a girl. The girls on the other hand have suddenly discovered that boys are " horrid ". The fond mother who invited the neighboring girls and boys to celebrate Willie's twelfth birthday suddenly

realizes that something is remarkably wrong. All the little girls are congregated in one corner where they giggle over mysterious secrets. All the little boys gather in another and become painfully conscious of the size of their hands and feet. The party has been a failure. Also Willie has become a different kind of a boy.

Outside on the athletic field changes just as startling have occurred. The third-grade teacher who tried to organize a baseball team in her room did not meet with much success. The boys entered into the idea with enthusiasm, but as soon as they reached the diamond it developed that there were nine candidates for the pitcher's box and no one to play right field. There were also nine candidates for the first place on the batting order. When the distracted teacher finally overcame these difficulties and had her team placed in the field she discovered to her consternation that the right fielder was chasing a butterfly and that the third baseman had gone home. Now, however, all this has changed. Willie is satisfied to play right fielder for the glory of the team. Although his own contribution may be a muffed fly and three strike-outs, he takes a vicarious pride in the achievements of the pitcher who fanned 13 opposing batters, and of the third baseman who made two home-runs. Something has happened inside Willie. He now no longer plays as an individual against other individuals but as a member of the team against other teams.

He is now eager to join a club. No longer does he get any thrill out of playing quietly in front of his house. He wants to join a society and if there is no boys' club in the vicinity, then he and his cronies form a gang of their own. The boy is now entering upon the gang age. He is learning the give and take of citizenship. The gang is teaching him to sacrifice his own interests for the good of the social whole. A school may teach him the technical requirements of citizenship, but the gang teaches him how to be a citizen.

The gang age, moreover, is the most important of all periods from the standpoint of the recreational leader. It is the period when boys are most eager to join, most pathetically helpless when left to themselves. Any boys' club or any recreational movement like the Boy Scouts will show an overwhelming majority of boys of the gang age. This is why

the psychology of the gang is so important to recreational workers. It is why our most successful projects, such as the Boy Scouts or the group clubs are organized into small units which are nothing less than conventionalized gangs.

The gang age, too is extremely important from the standpoint of the character of the child. He is yet plastic enough to be benefited immensely by the influences which are brought to bear on him and yet he is mature enough to begin to think for himself. He is wild, active, mischievous perhaps, but at the same time he is beginning to develop a personality of his own and is no longer passively dependent on the desires of his elders. This period of rapid development and radical readjustment may work great good to the boy under an intelligent learder or evil under the random influences of the street.

IV.

At the age of 14 or 15 other changes set in. The boy modifies his intransigent attitude towards girls. So far from despising them he finds that their company may be extremely fascinating. Since the feeling is quite mutual, dances and other social recreations begin to occupy a large part of his time. Scouting loses its old fascination. The boy drops away from his club. He plays the team games more scientifically and far better, but without something of the old *abandon*.

This is adolescence. The boy is now practically a man. There will be no other radical changes. He will become more intelligent and he will be better able to meet the problems of life as he acquires experience, but he will not be fundamentally different at 26 and at 16.

The recreation of the adolescent does not offer as many problems as the recreation of the younger boy. He is now largely able to manage his own affairs. He needs guidance and direction and advice, it is true; but he does not need to have all his activities organized for him as if he were a younger lad.

It will be seen that every stage has its own characteristic play. Infancy has its motor play, the preschool period its dramatic play, and later boyhood its individual competition. Team games are characteristic of the gang age and social recreation of adolescence. A competent play leader will take all

these into consideration when he is working out his program, never trying to combine in the same group boys who belong to different periods of development. Each of these periods must have its own organization. If one boys' club is to include lads from more than one of these ages there ought to be a separate division for each.

There is a great deal of difference between the man who organizes recreation through rule-of-thumb methods and the man who bases his work on an intelligent appreciation of the underlying principles, just as there is a great difference between the "practical nurse" who treats the sick without any insight into causes and the trained physician who is aided by the latest developments of scientific medicine. It is worth while, therefore, for the recreational leader to familiarize himself with the psychology of boyhood.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

(1) Blanton, Smiley, and Blanton, Margaret G.: *Child Guidance.* New York, London, The Century Company, 1927. xviii, 301 p.
Excellent popular treatment of the newer knowledge of childhood.

(2) Furfey, Paul Hanly: *The Gang Age; A Study of the Preadolescent Boy and His Recreational Needs.* New York, The Macmillan Company, 1926. xii, 189 p.
Modern psychology applied to recreation.

(3) Gesell, Arnold Lucius: *The Mental Growth of the Pre-School Child; A Psychological Outline of Normal Development from Birth to the Sixth Year, Including a System of Developmental Diagnosis.* New York, The Macmillan Company, 1925. x, 447 p.
By far the best book on infancy.

(4) Hall, Granville Stanley: *Youth; its Education, Regimen, and Hygiene.* New York, D. Appleton & Company, 1907. x, 379 p.
A compendium of his larger work *Adolescence.* A classic now largely out-of-date.

(5) Hennrich, Kilian: *Boy Guidance; A Course in Catholic Boy Leadership.* New York, Cincinnati, etc., Benziger Brothers, 1925. xiv, 239 p.
Concerned chiefly with the work of the Catholic Boys' Brigade.

(6) Hollingworth, Harry Levi: *Mental Growth and Decline; A Survey of Developmetal Psychology.* New York, London, D. Appleton and Company, 1927. xii, 396 p.
Excellent and thoroughly up-to-date.

(7) Koffka, Kurt: *The Growth of the Mind; An Introduction to Child-Psychology.* London, K. Paul, Trench, Trübner & Company, Ltd.; New York, Harcourt, Brace & Company, 1924. xvi, 382 p.
Written from the standpoint of the new *Gestalt-Psychologie.*

(8) Lee, Joseph: *Play in Education.* New York, The Macmillan Company, 1915. xxiii, 500 p.
An interpretation of childhood, fascinating though not intended to be scientific.

(9) O'Shea, Michael Vincent: *The Child: His Nature and His Needs; A Survey of Present-Day Knowledge Concerning Child Nature and the Promotion of the Well-Being and Education of the Young.* Valparaiso, Ind., The Children's Foundation, 1924. ix, 516 p.
An excellent popular summary.

(10) Pechstein, Louis Augustus, and McGregor, A. Laura: *Psychology of the Junior High School Pupil.* Boston, New York, etc., Houghton Mifflin Company, 1924. xix, 280 p.
The gang age from the educator's standpoint.

(11) Puffer, Joseph Adams: *The Boy and His Gang.* Boston, New York, etc., Houghton Mifflin Company, 1912. xi, 187 p.
Perhaps still the best study of the gang.

(12) Sheldon, Henry D.: "The Institutional Activities of American Children". *Am. Jour. Psychol.,* 9: 425-48, July '98.
A classical reference on gangs.

(13) Smith, C. F., and Fretwell, E. K.: "Clubs for Young Boys". *Teach. Coll. Rec.,* 22: 12-30, Jan. '21.
Tells about the *American Eagles.*

(14) Thrasher, Frederic M.: *The Gang; a study of 1,313 gangs in Chicago.* Chicago, The University of Chicago Press, 1927. xxi, 571 p.
Interesting but very uncritical.

PAUL HANLY FURFEY.

Washington, D. C.

THE FRANCISCANS IN NEW MEXICO.

THE story of the Franciscan pioneers in New Mexico is one that should be familiar to every Catholic school child in North America. There is no other mission field north of the Gulf of Mexico which was so generously watered with the blood of martyred priests. The honor of having discovered New Mexico belongs to the Franciscan priest, Fr. Marcos de Niza. As the Pueblo Indians, being town dwellers, had reached a higher stage of semi-civilization than any others north of Central Mexico, it is not surprising if tales of their "Seven Cities" should have permeated into Mexico through Indian captives. The arrival in Mexico City in 1536 of the pious layman Cabeza de Vaca and three other survivors of Narvaez' expedition to Florida after they had suffered years of slavery and had wandered from the west of Florida to the Pacific coast of Mexico, de Vaca healing the sick as he went along, revived interest in the mysterious lands of the north. It was determined to organize an exploring expedition to locate the famed Seven Cities and to Fr. Marcos de Niza, a learned and pious Franciscan who had already accompanied Pizarro into Peru, was the task entrusted in 1539. Accordingly the same year that De Soto led six hundred warriors in armor into Florida, Fr. Marcos, accompanied only by the

Moor Estevanico, who was one of de Vaca's companions, and by some Indian guides, entered Arizona and New Mexico. Fr. Marcos, as has been well remarked, is the first of those priestly explorers who unarmed and afoot penetrated into the very heart of the North American Continent. He sent Estevanico ahead as a scout with orders to report back to him if he discovered anything of importance. The vain negro, who was treated by the Indians as if he were some potentate, did not wait for the friar. His pride was humbled when he reached the first of the "Seven Cities of Cibola", for the Zuni warriors imprisoned him and put him to death. Fr. Marcos, though warned by friendly Indians of the death of the negro, pushed on, till on a distant hill he beheld with his own eyes one of those Seven Cities of which he had heard such wondrously exaggerated tales. It was the Zuñi pueblo of Hawikuh, and at that distance in the rarefied air it appeared to Fr. Marcos larger than Mexico City. He raised a cross and naming the land the New Dominion of St. Francis took possession of it in the name of "Don Antonio de Mendoza, through the favor of the Emperor, our lord, Viceroy and Governor of New Spain".

When Fr. Marcos had returned to Mexico and delivered an account of what he had seen and heard, especially the latter, excitement knew no bounds. The able Viceroy Mendoza enlisted three hundred men under Francisco Vásquez de Coronado, most of whom belonged to the gentry, and in 1540 this gay and gallant band, guided by Fr. Marcos, headed northward seeking fame and fortune. Five Franciscans accompanied the party seeking the salvation of souls.

When Coronado reached and conquered Hawikuh (15 miles southwest of Zuñi), he found it was a pueblo town, no more and no less. Coronado and his party were quite indignant with Fr. Marcos, and some even threatened violence, though if they had carefully read the friar's report and had distinguished between what he said he saw and what he said he heard, they would have realized that he was guilty of no deceit or conscious exaggeration. In any case, Fr. Marcos was now provincial of the Franciscans of New Spain and, having accomplished his task as guide, had to get back to his post. He accordingly returned with an accompanying Brother

to Mexico that same year. Eighteen years later he died in the monastery of San Francisco in Mexico City.

Two years of exploration from the Gulf of California to Texas and Kansas convinced Coronado that this northern land was not another Mexico or Peru, and accordingly he returned disgusted, failing to realize that its potential wealth, if patiently developed, was unlimited. If, however, Coronado abandoned the north in disgust, not so did the three Franciscans. They sought souls, not gold, and there were plenty of souls to save. Fr. Juan de Padilla, who had been a successful Indian missionary for fifteen years in New Spain before joining this expedition, was determined that the Quivira in far distant Kansas should not be left without a priest. Accordingly, accompanied by a Portuguese soldier Andres Docampo, two Franciscan oblates and some Indian guides, he returned to Kansas. There while on a missionary journey he was killed by hostile Indians in 1542. The Portuguese and the oblates, after a well nigh incredible journey lasting nine years during which they zigzagged up and down the arid plains, finally reached New Spain and made known to the world the glorious death of the Apostle of the Quivira Indians. Father Padilla is the protomartyr of the Catholic Church in the United States.

Meanwhile Father Juan de la Cruz labored among the Tiguex Indians but he also was martyred near the present Bernalillo, New Mexico. Brother Luis Descolona labored on the Pecos River, and it is assumed with reason that he also was put to death by pagans. The Franciscans had begun their missionary work in true Franciscan style. Their missionaries were martyred.

A generation passed before a second attempt was made. The country of the Pueblos was two thousand miles north of Mexico City and much of the intervening territory had not yet been evangelized and settled. In 1580, however, Brother Augustin Rodriguez, who alone on foot went as far north as the Rio Grande del Norte near El Paso, urged the evangelization of the country which henceforth went by the name he gave it, New Mexico. His appeal was heard. In 1581 a party of Franciscans guided by him reëntered the abandoned mission field. The party consisted of Fr. Francisco Lopez, the Superior of the little band, Fr. Juan de Santa Maria,

Brother Rodriguez, nine soldier-traders and nineteen Indian servants. When the party reached the pueblo Puaray, near the present Bernalillo, New Mexico, missionary activities began. The soldiers, who had been looking for mines and thought they had discovered something, returned to New Spain and once again, as two score years before, three Franciscans, two of them priests and the third a lay brother, were alone in New Mexico. Seeing the need of more recruits, Fr. Juan de Santa Maria undertook the journey alone to Mexico City. It was a walk of over 2,000 miles! Being somewhat of an astronomer, he determined to follow a direct line instead of the route by which they had come. On the third day of his journey, while he lay asleep under a tree, Indians deprived him of life by crushing his head with a heavy stone. They then burned his body. At Puaray a hostile Indian killed Fr. Francisco Lopez with a war club. He was buried by Brother Augustin Rodriguez who was the only herald of Christ left in this vast country. Though he was befriended by the chief of the pueblo of Puaray, the Tiguex Indians killed him also and cast his body into the river. As in 1542, so in 1581: three Franciscans in this center of North America were martyred.

When the Franciscans of the Zacatecan custody learned that the tiny guard of nine soldiers had abandoned the Franciscans in New Mexico, they were anxious to have a relief expedition organized. Antonio Espejo, a gentleman as wealthy as he was pious, thereupon organized an expedition at his own expense. Espejo, accompanied by one friar and fourteen soldiers entered New Mexico in 1583 and proved a very successful explorer. He wished to return the following year as Captain General and conquer and settle the country, but was refused permission by the King.

Fourteen years passed before Espejo's plan of conquering and settling New Mexico was carried out, and then the choice fell upon Juan de Oñate. His expedition of 1598 made New Mexico a permanent Spanish colony and Christian mission land. The missionaries were of course Franciscans and numbered eight priests, two brothers, and two tertiaries. On 7 July, 1598, seven chieftains representing about 34 pueblos acknowledged the supremacy of the Spanish King. On 8 September, the feast of the Nativity of the Blessed Virgin

Mary, the first permanent church was formally opened at San Juan which is on the eastern bank of the Rio Grande not far from the junction of the Chama. Hence eight years before the English made their first permanent settlement on the mainland of North America, the Spanish had a colony and a church in the present territory of the United States over one thousand miles inland. About two years later San Gabriel (the present Chamita), westward across the river from San Juan, became the capital of the colony. Meanwhile the Gibraltar of the treacherous Queres, the sky town on the precipitous rock of Acoma was captured by seventy Spanish soldiers—one of the bravest feats of arms in history. It so astonished the natives that further resistance was deemed inadvisable and Oñate was master of New Mexico.

New Mexico, thus permanently established as a Spanish colony and Catholic mission land by Oñate and the Franciscans in 1598, suffered the inevitable initial doubts, difficulties and dissensions. The colonists, who were a good class of people, wanted to see stock raising and agriculture developed, and friendly relations maintained with the Indians. Oñate, on the other hand, thought more of explorations, conquests, and tribute. The Franciscans sided with the colonists, as only that policy would further the conversion of the Indians and the upbuilding of a Christian state. From a Spanish state paper of 1609 we learn that in the previous year there were in New Mexico seventy colonists, thirty of whom were capable of bearing arms, and seven thousand Indian converts. King Philip III, having heard of the dissensions that were troubling the colony, accepted the resignation of Oñate and, by his royal authority, his Viceroy in New Spain appointed Pedro de Peralta Governor of New Mexico. Peralta's instructions were to maintain and develop the colony, to establish a Villa, to deal justly with the converted Indians and permit no one to go on excursions to the unfriendly Indians except the religious who in apostolic fashion should preach to them. The Villa or city to be founded was Santa Fé. This city was actually established either toward the end of 1609 or within the next few years. On 3 January, 1617 its town council petitioned the King to aid his colony, stating that " although the Friars had built eleven churches and converted fourteen thousand

natives and prepared as many more for conversion, there were only forty-eight soldiers and settlers in the colony". Perhaps the most famous of the forgotten heroes who accomplished these wonderful conversions in New Mexico in the second decade of the seventeenth century was Fr. Geronimo de Zarate Salmeron, The Apostle of the Jemes, who converted 6,636 chiefly of that nation, wrote a primer of Christian doctrine in their language and also published in 1626 his valuable *Relaciones.* Equally deserving of renown is Fr. Juan Ramirez, who in 1629 walked alone to the Pueblo Gibraltar, Acoma, and, disregarding missiles hurled at him from above, ascended the precipitous cliffs of this city of the Rock, and by a pacific conquest greater than that of any soldier won this pagan pueblo to the faith of Christ.

The missions of New Mexico were in 1622 raised to the rank of a custody and under Fr. Alonzo de Benavides, the first custodian, made rapid progress. By 1626 the total number of the souls that had been baptized since the formation of the missions was 34,650. Fr. Benavides doubled the number of the missionaries, established new missions and built new churches, and upon the expiration of his period of office in 1629 wrote his famous Memorial, which is the most valuable of all the early pictures of the New Mexico mission field. There were then in New Mexico 43 churches, most of them in stone. As the Indian men—though they were willing to war and hunt, spin and weave—considered it unmanly to build, these stone churches were built, under the direction of the Friars, by the Indian women, girls, and boys! Destroyed during the revolt of 1680, and rebuilt after the reëstablishment of the missions, these early churches stand, some of them to this day, a monument to the zeal and civilization which the Indians had acquired from the Friars. Truly the Pueblo Indians had valiant women!

Fr. Benavides, in his memorial to the King of Spain, gives a pen picture of the life and work of the Franciscan missionaries in New Mexico. In part it reads:

> It may well be inferred from all that has been said, how brilliant are the toils and peregrinations of the religious of my Father St. Francis in the service of God our Lord; for not only have they

taken away from the demon the empire over those souls which he enjoyed so much without contradiction, but they have removed all idolatry and demon worship, and now only the Lord and Creator of all things is adored; and where appeared but estufas of idolatry, today the whole country is covered with very sumptuous and marvelous temples, which the religious have built, and about which they have been so solicitous that, in order to make them such, they stripped themselves of that which Your Majesty gives them for their sustenance and clothing.

The occupation which they have is that of Mary and Martha—like Martha, leading an active life, they heal the sick and sustain the needy poor, for this purpose causing fields to be sown and cattle raised. In addition to this, they break up the soil for the Indians who do not live in settlements, and after having constructed habitations and the entire village for them, tilled and planted the land for them, given them everything necessary for the first months, they induce them to live there like civilized people. There they teach them to recite the whole Christian Doctrine and to acquire good habits. In like manner they teach the boys to read, write, and sing. There is cause for praising the Lord that in so short a time so many chapels have been erected in which the ecclesiastical chant is sung. Furthermore, all the crafts and arts useful to man are carried on, such as those of tailors, shoemakers, carpenters, blacksmiths, and others in which they are already skilful; but all depends on the solicitude and care of the religious, so much so that if he should be wanting, all this good order and the whole civilized manner of living, in which they are instructed after our method, would cease.

Like Mary, too, they are not wanting in the contemplative life, which is the monastic state they have professed; for, despite so many exterior occupations in the administration of the holy Sacraments (not resting from one pueblo to another, because there is not a religious who is not in charge of four or five pueblos), they live in such a way that it seems they are in a community; for Matins are never neglected at midnight, nor the Little Hours, nor the high Mass at the usual time. Thus the convents are regulated in such conformity that they appear to be sanctuaries rather than the dwellings of single friars.

Notwithstanding such continuous occupations, the fasts are observed, even the Benediction Fast. Likewise many other spiritual exercises are performed which edify the Spaniards as well as the Indians, who regard the friars as angels. I have wished to touch this matter by the way, whilst omitting many other things that might be related, merely that Your Majesty might know the quality and

virtue of those chaplains of Yours, who with so much gratefulness, love, and good will commend to God Your Majesty in that secluded and distant corner, and in that primitive Church where the Lord works so many wonders.

The difficulties the Franciscan missionaries had to face in this centre of North America are well described by a nineteenth century Protestant writer, Charles F. Lummis, in his *Spanish Pioneers,* published in 1893. His words are well worth citing, if for no other reason than to make more popular a book that cannot be too widely read. At present it is unfortunately out of print.

There have been missionaries elsewhere whose flocks were as long ungrateful and murderous, but few if any who were more out of the world. New Mexico has been for three hundred and fifty years, and is today, largely a wilderness, threaded with a few slender oases. To people of the Eastern states a desert seems very far off; but there are hundreds of thousands of square miles in our own Southwest to this day where the traveller is very likely to die of thirst, and where poor wretches every year do perish by that most awful of deaths. Even now there is no trouble in finding hardship and danger in New Mexico; and once it was one of the cruellest wildernesses conceivable. Scarce a decade has gone by since an end was put to the Indian wars and harassments, which had lasted continuously for more than three centuries. When Spanish colonist or Spanish missionary turned his back on Old Mexico to traverse the thousand-mile, roadless desert to New Mexico, he took his life in his hands; and every day in that savage province he was in equal danger. If he escaped death by thirst or starvation on the way, if the party was not wiped out by the merciless Apache, then he settled in the wilderness as far from any other home of white men as Chicago is from Boston. If a missionary, he was generally alone with a flock of hundreds of cruel savages; if a soldier or a farmer, he had from two hundred to fifteen hundred friends in an area as big as New England, New York, Pennsylvania, and Ohio combined, in the very midst of a hundred thousand swarthy foes whose war-whoop he was likely to hear at any moment, and never had long chance to forget. He came poor, and that niggard land never made him rich. Even in the beginning of this century, when some began to have large flocks of sheep, they were often left penniless by one night's raid of Apaches or Navajos.

Such was New Mexico when the missionaries came, and very nearly such it remained for more than three hundred years. If the most

enlightened and hopeful mind in the Old World could have looked across to that arid land, it would never have dreamed that soon the desert was to be dotted with churches, and not little log or mud chapels, but massive stone masonries whose ruins stand today, the noblest in our North America. But so it was; neither wilderness nor savage could balk that great zeal. . . .

In 1617—three years before Plymouth Rock—there were already eleven churches in use in New Mexico. Santa Fé was the only Spanish town; but there were also churches at the dangerous Indian pueblos of Galisteo and Pecos, two at Jemez (nearly one hundred miles west of Santa Fé, and in an appalling wilderness), Taos (as far north), San Yldefonso, Santa Clara, Sandia, San Felipe, and Santo Domingo. It was a wonderful achievement for each lonely missionary—for they had neither civil nor military assistance in their parishes—so soon to have induced his barbarous flock to build a big stone church, and worship there the new white God. The churches in the two Jemez pueblos had to be abandoned about 1622 on account of incessant harassment by the Navajos, who from time immemorial had ravaged that section, but were occupied again in 1626. The Spaniards were confined by the necessities of the desert, so far as home-making went, to the valley of the Rio Grande, which runs about north and south through the middle of New Mexico. But their missionaries were under no such limitation. Where the colonists could not exist, they could pray and teach; and very soon they began to penetrate the deserts which stretch far on either side from that narrow ribbon of colonizable land. At Zuñi, far west of the river and three hundred miles from Santa Fé, the missionaries had established themselves as early as 1629. Soon they had six churches in six of the "Seven Cities of Cibola" (the Zuñi towns), of which the one at Chyánahue is still beautifully preserved; and in the same period they had taken foothold two hundred miles deeper yet in the desert, and built three churches among the wondrous cliff-towns of Moqui.

Down the Rio Grande there was similar activity. At the ancient pueblo of San Antonio de Senecú, now nearly obliterated, a church was founded in 1629 by Fray Antonio de Arteaga; and the same brave man, in the same year, founded another at the pueblo of Nuestra Señora del Socorro—now the American town of Socorro. The church in the pueblo of Picuries, far in the northern mountains, was built before 1632, for in that year Fray Ascension de Zárate was buried in it. The church at Isleta, about in the centre of New Mexico, was built before 1635. A few miles above Glorieta, one can see from the windows of a train on the Santa Fé route a large and impressive adobe ruin, whose fine walls dream away in that enchanted sunshine. It is the old church of the pueblo of Pecos; and those

walls were reared two hundred and seventy-five years ago. The pueblo, once the largest in New Mexico, was deserted in 1840; and its great quadrangle of many-storied Indian houses is in utter ruin; but above their gray mounds still tower the walls of the old church which was built before there was a Saxon in New England. You see the "mud brick", as some contemptuously call the adobe, is not such a contemptible thing, even for braving the storms of centuries. There was a church at the pueblo of Nambe by 1642. In 1662 Fray Garcia de San Francisco founded a church at El Paso del Norte, on the present boundary-line between Mexico and the United States—a dangerous frontier mission, hundreds of miles alike from the Spanish settlements in Old and New Mexico.

The missionaries also crossed the mountains east of the Rio Grande and established missions among the Pueblos who dwelt in the edge of the great plains. Fray Geronimo de la Llana founded the noble church at Cuaray about 1642; and soon after came those at Abó, Tenabo, and Tabirá (better, though incorrectly, known now as the Gran Quivíra). The churches at Cuaray Abó, and Tabirá are the grandest ruins in the United States, and much finer than many ruins which Americans go abroad to see. The second and larger church at Tabirá was built between 1660 and 1670; and at about the same time and in the same region—though many thirsty miles away—the churches at Tajique and Chililí. Acoma, as you know, had a permanent missionary by 1629; and he built a church. Besides all these, the pueblos of Zia, Santa Ana, Tesuque, Pojoaque, San Juan, San Marcos, San Lazaro, San Cristobal, Alameda, Santa Cruz, and Cochiti had each a church by 1680. That shows something of the thoroughness of Spanish missionary work. A century before our nation was born, the Spanish had built in one of our Territories half a hundred permanent churches, nearly all of stone, and nearly all for the express benefit of the Indians. That is a missionary record which has never been equalled elsewhere in the United States even to this day; and in all our country we had not built by that time so many churches for ourselves.

A glimpse at the life of the missionary to New Mexico in the days before there was an English-speaking preacher in the whole western hemisphere is strangely fascinating to all who love that lonely heroism which does not need applause or companionship to keep it alive. To be brave in battle or any similar excitement is a very easy thing. But to be a hero alone and unseen, amid not only danger but every hardship and discouragement, is quite another matter.

The missionary to New Mexico had of course to come first from Old Mexico—or, before that, from Spain. Some of these quiet, gray-robed men had already seen such wanderings and such dangers

as even the Stanleys of nowadays do not know. They had to furnish their own vestments and church furniture, and to pay for their own transportation from Mexico to New Mexico—for very early a "line" of semi-annual, armed expeditions across the bitter intervening wilderness was arranged. The fare was $266, which made serious havoc with the good man's salary of $150 a year (at which figure the salaries remained up to 1665, when they were raised to $330, payable every three years). . . . Out of this meagre pay—which was all the synod itself could afford to give him—he had to pay all the expenses of himself and his church. Arriving, after a perilous trip, in perilous New Mexico—and the journey and the Territory were still dangerous in the present generation—the missionary proceeded first to Santa Fé. His superior there soon assigned him a parish; and turning his back on the one little colony of his countrymen, the fray trudged on foot fifty, one hundred, or three hundred miles, as the case might be, to his new and unknown post. Sometimes an escort of three or four Spanish soldiers accompanied him; but often he made that toilsome and perilous walk alone. His new parishioners received him sometimes with a storm of arrows, and sometimes in sullen silence. He could not speak to them, nor they to him; and the very first thing he had to do was to learn from such unwilling teachers their strange tongue—a language much more difficult to acquire than Latin, Greek, French, or German. Entirely alone among them, he had to depend upon himself and upon the untender mercies of his flock for life and all its necessities. If they decided to kill him, there was no possibility of resistance. If they refused him food, he must starve. If he became sick or crippled, there were no nurses or doctors for him except these treacherous savages. I do not think there was ever in history a picture of more absolute loneliness and helplessness and hopelessness than the lives of these unheard-of martyrs; and as for mere danger, no man ever faced greater.

The provision made for the support of the missionaries was very simple. Besides the small salary paid him by the synod, the pastor must receive some help from his parish. This was a moral as well as a material necessity. That interest partly depends on personal giving, is a principle recognized in all churches. So at once the Spanish laws commanded from the pueblos the same contribution to the church as Moses himself established. Each Indian family was required to give the tithe and the first fruits to the church, just as they had always given them to their pagan cacique. This was no burden to the Indians, and it supported the priest in a very humble way. Of course the Indians did not give a tithe; at first they gave just as little as they could. The "father's" food was their corn,

beans, and squashes, with only a little meat rarely from their hunts—for it was a long time before there were flocks of cattle or sheep to draw from. He also depended on his unreliable congregation for help in cultivating his little plot of ground, for wood to keep him from freezing, in those high altitudes, and even for water —since there were no waterworks nor even wells, and all water had to be brought considerable distances in jars. Dependent wholly upon such suspicious, jealous, treacherous helpers, the good man often suffered greatly from hunger and cold. There were no stores, of course, and if he could not get food from the Indians he must starve. Wood was in some cases twenty miles distant, as it is from Isleta today. His labors also were not small. He must not only convert these utter pagans to Christianity, but teach them to read and write, to farm by better methods, and, in general, to give up their barbarism for civilization.

How difficult it was to do this even the statesmen of to-day can hardly measure; but what was the price in blood is simple to be understood. It was not the killing now and then of one of these noble men by his ungrateful flock—it was almost a habit. It was not the sin of one or two towns. The pueblos of Taos, Picuries, San Yldefonso, Nambé, Pojoaque, Tesuque, Pecos, Galisteo, San Marcos, Santo Domingo, Cochiti, San Felipe, Puaray, Jemez, Acoma, Halona, Hauicu, Ahuatui, Mishongenivi, and Oraibe—twenty different towns—at one time or another murdered their respective missionaries. Some towns repeated the crime several times. . . .

These last words of Mr. Lummis recall one of the greatest glories of the New Mexican mission—its martyrs. The martyrs of 1542 and 1581 had a glorious line of successors. On 28 December, 1631 Fr. Pedro Mirando was martyred at Taos; on 22 February, 1632 (a hundred years exactly before George Washington was born) Fr. Francisco Letrado was killed by the Zunis; a week later, Fr. Martin de Arvide suffered a like fate from the same Indians; on 28 June, 1633 Fr. Francisco Porras, famous for having restored sight to a blind boy, was poisoned by the Moqui and died at Agwatobi in the present States of Arizona and is therefore the proto-martyr of that State. Hence within a century of the discovery of New Mexico by Fr. Marcos de Niza twelve Franciscans had been martyred. The total number of Christian Indians, when the missions were at their zenith, may have been as high as 50,000, though Fr. Benavides gives even a larger figure. Some ninety pueblos had been won to Christ.

The devil, however, was not idle. He determined to destroy the kingdom of Christ in New Mexico. First of all the civil authority must be turned against the Friars. The Franciscans rightly disapproved of the vexatious and at times extortionate attitude of the Governor toward the natives. The Governors resented this interference of the priests in "civil matters" and as a consequence became unfriendly to the Friars. Things came to a head in 1683 under the worthless Governor Penalosa. He was deprived of office and escaping to London and Paris turned traitor to Spain. These dissensions between the civil and ecclesiastical authorities weakened the influence of the Friars with the natives. Meanwhile the pagan Navajos martyred Fr. Pedro de Avila y Ayala, 7 October, 1672 at Hawikuh (fifteen miles southwest of the present pueblo of Zuñi) and burned the church. On 23 January, 1675 Apaches fell upon the Piros pueblo of Senecú and slaughtered Fr. Gil de Avila and many of his congregation.

The real storm however came in 1680. The pagan forces were marshaled with diabolical skill by an Indian medicine man named Popé. "He claimed to have been chosen by the ancient spirits to establish a great empire; and that he had formed a compact with the demon to exterminate the white invaders of the country." Partly out of a pagan hatred of Christianity and partly of an Indian hatred of their white ruler, the majority of the pueblos listened to Popé and joined the conspiracy. The pagan Indians and nominally Christian Indians were won over. The truly Christian Indians were terrorized or deceived. The military force of the Spaniards was pitiably small; only five soldiers at each frontier station and ten soldiers at Santa Fé. This was the army for the defence of an inland colony larger than Spain. Some of the Franciscans, for example Fr. Velasco of Tecos, were warned of the approaching conspiracy and given an opportunity to escape, but they preferred to remain with their flocks. The Governor, though warned by the Friars, failed to realize the gravity of the situation till the very eve of the insurrection. Then he sent hasty orders for the missionaries and settlers south of San Felipe to retreat to Isleta and those north of it to Santa Fé. The blow fell on the feast of the St. Lawrence, martyr, 10 August, 1680. Eighteen Franciscan fathers, three

brothers, and 380 Spanish colonists, men, women, children and domestics, were massacred. About two thousand Spaniards, including the remaining Franciscans, eleven in number, escaped either to the south or to Santa Fé. At Santa Fé the Governor managed to get one hundred Spaniards under arms and by a successful sortie defeated the three thousand Indians, then besieging the city under Popé. This enabled him to lead the thousand refugees, who had gathered in the capital, safely southward to El Paso, now Juarez on the Mexican side of the Rio Grande, just opposite the Texas El Paso. Thus it came that the colony of New Mexico where the soldiers and colonists of Spain had performed such prodigies of valor and the Franciscans such miracles of missionary zeal was destroyed by the forces of barbarism and paganism. A local Julian the Apostate was emperor of the Pueblos.

Shea in his standard History of the Catholic Church of the United States regrets that he was not able to find the names of more than one half of the Franciscan martyrs of 1680. The complete list, as given by Vetancurt in 1697, is as follows (I quote from "The Franciscans in New Mexico" by Fr. Zephyrin Englehardt, O. F. M., from the *Franciscan Herald* of September 1921, page 337):

Franciscans killed at the various pueblos on 10 August, 1680, according to Vetancurt, were the following:

Santo Domingo—Fathers Juan Talaban, ex-custodio (Spaniard), Francsico Antonio de Lorenzana, guardian in charge (Spaniard), and Francisco de Montesdeca[1] (Mexican).

San Lorenzo de Tezúque—Fr. Juan Bautista Pio (Spaniard).

San Francisco de Nambé—Fr. Thomas de Torres (Mexican).

San Ildefonso—Fathers Luis de Morales (Spaniard), and Antonio Sanches de Pro (Mexican).

San Lorenzo de Picuries—Fr. Matias Rendon (Mexican).

San Gerónimo de los Taos—Fr. Antonio de Mora and Brother Juan de Pedrosa (both Mexicans).

San Estévan de Acoma—Fr. Lucas Maldonado (Mexican).

San Diego de los Jémes—Fr. Juan de Jesus (Spaniard).

Purisima Concepcion de Alona (Zuñi District)—Fr. Juan de Bal (Spaniard).

[1] Thus this name is given in the first edition of Vetancurt published in Mexico 1697-8 (pp. 100-103 of the Chronica). In the edition of 1871 of the whole Teatro Mexicano followed by Englehardt the name reads José de Montes de Oca.

San Bernardino de Aguatobi (Moqui district)—Fr. José de Figueroa (Mexican).

San Bartolomé de Xongopabi (Moqui District)—Fr. José Trujillo (Spaniard).

San Francisco de Oraibi (Moqui district)—Fathers José de Espeleta (Spaniard) and Augustin de San Maria (Mexican).

Santa Cruz de Galisteo—Fr. Juan Bernal, the Superior of the Custody, and Fr. Domingo de Vera (both Mexicans).

Nuestra Señora de los Angeles de Porciuncula de Pecos—Fr. Fernando de Velasco (Spaniard).

San Marcos—Fr. Manuel Tinoco (Spaniard).

For a dozen years the forces of paganism held sway over New Mexico. Popé ordered the destruction of all the churches and of all religious articles and the reopening of the estufas for pagan sorcery. He forbade the invocation of the name of Jesus or Mary and ordered all men to put away their wives and take others to their own liking. Baptismal names were to be dropped and every vestige of Spanish civilization blotted out. Popé ruled his people with a rod of iron and punished even with the death penalty those who dared oppose his orders. His heavy tributes and galling tyranny caused civil wars. Half of the population was wiped out in the turmoil which followed. "Barbarism darker than that of aboriginal times settled upon this northern land."

It was out of the question, however, for Spain to abandon New Mexico to these barbarians. In 1692 and 1693 a military expedition under Governor Vargas conquered the country.

The Indians were once more the object of the patient zeal of the Friars, twenty of whom came to New Mexico in 1693. The history of the Catholic Church, however, shows that a race which has once abandoned the faith is very hard to win back. In the beginning of the seventeenth century the Franciscans had converted two distinct groups of peoples, the Pueblo Indians of New Mexico and the Moqui or Hopi of northern Arizona. The Moqui never again listened to the ambassadors of Christ. The Pueblo Indians listened at first with great reluctance and afterward half-heartedly. The first missionaries placed in the various pueblos after the conquest of 1693 found the Indians so hostile that they felt that another rising was imminent and consequently they retired to Santa Fé to

wait till the storm blew over. The Governor disregarded the warnings of the Friars and intimated to them that they were lacking in courage. The charge of cowardice, baseless though it was, was a hard one to bear. Accordingly the Friars returned to their posts and calmly awaited their fate. They did not have long to wait. On 4 June, 1696 the Picuries, Taos, Tehuas, Tanos, Queres and Jemes rose in insurrection. Five Friars were martyred: Fr. Francisco Corvera and Antonio Moreno were burnt to death in their convent at San Ildefonso by the Tehua Indians; Frs. José de Arbizu and Antonio Carbonel were killed by the Taos, while Fr. Francisco de Casañas was clubbed to death by the Jemes. Fr. Casañas was the first martyr of the newly founded Apostolic Missionary College of Querétaro, which in the eighteenth century furnished Texas and southern Arizona with missionaries and martyrs. It is important to note that with the exception of a few Friars from the Querétaro College who labored in New Mexico in the years 1693 to 1696, all the Franciscan missionaries and martyrs in New Mexico belonged to the province of Santo Evangelio of Mexico. They were therefore not Grey Friars but Azules or Blue Friars. For the Mexican friars had abandoned the original grey color of the Franciscan habit for blue. This innovation was adopted originally out of a spirit of poverty, a native blue dye being used when the old, worn-out habits had been made over. The Friars of the Apostolic Colleges, however, retained the original grey habit worn by the Franciscans in Spain.

With the martyrdoms of 1696 the golden age of the Franciscans in New Mexico came to an end. From 1540, when Fr. Marcos de Niza led Fr. Juan de Padilla and his companions to New Mexico, to 1696, when the reëstablishment of the mission was sealed with the blood of five priests, no less than thirty-eight Franciscans were martyred. The history of the Franciscans in New Mexico during the century and a half which followed the martyrdoms of 1696, though rich in meritorious deeds, cannot compare with the earlier period. The first generation of the eighteenth century was signalized by the reconversion of the pueblos. In 1730 there were twenty-four Friars at work. This seems to have been the average number throughout the century. In 1749 the Christian Indians num-

bered 13,500 of whom 1,400 were in the El Paso district. The Spaniards at that time were at least 5,000 in number. The efforts made to convert the 8,000 Moqui Indians in northern Arizona, where five Franciscans had been martyred in the seventeenth century, proved unavailing. One town Awatobi which had shown itself somewhat friendly to the missionaries in 1700 was for that reason destroyed by the neighboring Moquis; its buildings were burned, its men slaughtered, and its women enslaved. The Bishop of Durango, to whose diocese New Mexico belonged since 1620, though neither he nor any of his predecessors had yet visited it, wrongly imagined that the failure to reconvert the Moquis was due to a lack of sufficient zeal on the part of the Franciscans. As a consequence he proposed in 1716 that the Moqui mission be given to the Jesuits of Sonora. This was done by various royal decrees in 1719, 1726 and 1741. However the Jesuits of Sonora found it difficult even to reach the Moqui district and when some of their missionaries eventually reached it, they were not able to accomplish anything. The Moqui mission field was accordingly returned to the Franciscans in 1745. Meanwhile in 1742 two Franciscans visited a Moqui town and brought back to the Christian missions of New Mexico 441 of the Tiguas who had wandered there after the revolt of 1680. In 1745 three Franciscans counted 10,846 Indians in the Moqui towns but they were unable to convert them. The last great effort to convert the Moquis was in 1776 when Frs. Escalente and Dominguez, after having on an exploring expedition discovered Salt Lake in Utah, entered the Moqui territory from the north, while Fr. Garcés, the south Arizona missionary who was later martyred on the Colorado in California, came to the Moqui towns from the south. The Moquis, however, stubbornly refused to listen to the Gospel. God now punished them. Three years of drought, famine and pestilence nearly wiped out the race, reducing their number to 798.

Meanwhile Bishop Crespo, of Durango, determined to visit New Mexico, as it belonged to his diocese. The southernmost post in New Mexico, namely El Paso, was five hundred miles north from Durango. Bishop Crespo arrived there in 1725, the first bishop ever to set foot in New Mexico. He reëntered the country in 1730 and, reaching Santa Fé, began a general

visitation. The Friars, having had exclusive ecclesiastical control of New Mexico for one hundred and ninety years, questioned the authority of the bishop, an anomalous proceeding for persons styling themselves by the humble title of the Lesser Brothers, Fratres Minores. Then began a long ecclesiastical law suit to decide what scope the Friars' extraordinary privileges and exemptions left for the exercise of the pastoral authority of the bishop of the diocese. The Friars were blamed, though unjustly, for their failure to reconvert the Moquis. They were further blamed for not learning the native languages. It was rightly pointed out that the hearing of Indian confessions by means of an interpreter was both disadvantageous and against canon law. Spanish was being more and more widely spoken by the Pueblo Indians, and some of the missionaries, seeing that the majority of the Christians of New Mexico spoke Spanish, were dispensing themselves from the drudgery of learning the various Indian dialects. The Pueblo Indians speak Spanish to this day, as do the Indians of Spanish America from Mexico to Chile. However, strict orders were issued that the Friars acquainted with the Indian dialects should prepare vocabularies for the use of the others.

The outstanding fact in the history of New Mexico in the second half of the eighteenth century is that this State, from having been an Indian settlement with a minority of whites, became a Mexican province with a minority of Indians. The Pueblo Indians lost 5,025 in a smallpox epidemic of 1780-1 and never numbered again more than 10,000. On the other hand while in 1749 the Spaniards or rather Mexicans numbered perhaps only 5,000, in 1779 they numbered 18,226 in New Mexico proper, and 5,000 in the El Paso district. Three-quarters of the Catholics of New Mexico were now Spaniards or Mexicans and accordingly the majority of the two dozen Friars working there necessarily devoted most of their time to them. Another result of the rapid increase in the white and half-breed population was the introduction of secular priests into such important centers as Santa Fé, El Paso, La Canada (founded in 1695) and Albuquerque (founded in 1706). Despite this introduction of three or four seculars New Mexico did not have half the number of priests it needed. The colony required also schools and a college. While the greater part of New Spain

had been generously supplied with secondary colleges from the first years of the conquest and with a university from 1551, New Mexico was from an educational standpoint an utterly abandoned outpost. At last in 1777 the king authorized the formation of a religious college at Santa Fé and the Pope gave his approval two years later. Unfortunately the cruel expulsion of the Jesuits from Spanish America by Carlos III in 1767 deprived the majority of the colleges of New Spain of their teachers. By a second decree in 1768 the Bourbon monarch excluded all religious orders from teaching in colleges. This rendered out of the question the formation of a new college in the far north. The Franciscans were obliged to use their every available priest for the mission field which was now greatly increased in size by the taking over of the Jesuit Missions in Sonora and by the establishment of the new missions in Upper California. Under such circumstances poor New Mexico had to wait for happier days. They did not come under the Spanish or the Mexican regime.

It is only too obvious that New Mexico needed a bishop. As early as 1631 the Secretary General of the Order of St. Francis who was also Commissary General of the Indies proposed Sante Fé as the site of a bishopric, but this very reasonable proposition was not entertained by the Spanish King who by virtue of his royal patronage had the deciding voice in this matter. In 1812 Pedro Bautista Pino, who had been elected the New Mexican delegate to the Spanish Cortes, proposed the formation of a bishopric, college and system of schools in New Mexico. His statement, which he published, showed that there were a score of Friars and a couple of secular priests in New Mexico.[2] The Cortes approved of the formation of the bishopric and college but nothing resulted. In 1822, the year of Mexican independence, the Christian population of New Mexico was 40,000 of whom 10,000 were Indians and 30,000

[2] Pino in *Noticias de la antigua provincia del Nuevo-Mexico*, presented to the Spanish Cortes held at Cadiz in 1812, states that the Bishops of Durango, though receiving their tithes from New Mexico, had not visited it for over fifty years, nor had Confirmation been administered during that period; twenty-two Franciscans of the province of Mexico (i.e. Santo Evangelio) minister to the needs of the faithful, there being secular priests in Santa Fé and El Paso only. There were some 18 schools. The whole province consisted of 26 Indian towns and 102 Spanish "plazas". (See the 1849 edition of Pino's *Noticias* edited by Don José Augustin de Escudero, pp. 31-2.)

Mexicans. The Mexican Cortes in 1823 and 1830 approved of the formation of a bishopric in New Mexico but nothing was done. The history of the Catholic Church in New Mexico under the Mexican regime, 1822 to 1846, is not an inspiring one. First of all the supply of priests from Spain was definitely cut off. Then the Mexican Republic, in an outburst of nativism resulting from Spain's failure to recognize its independence, ordered in 1826 the expulsion from Mexico of all men of Spanish birth unless they were sixty years of age or married to a Mexican woman. This disastrous decree resulted in the expulsion of many Spanish priests throughout the Republic, and both the secular and the regular clergy saw themselves weakened in the quanity as well as the quality of their subjects. The decree was extended to New Mexico and California by a supplementary regulation in 1829. Another result of the new regime was the transfer in 1826 of various parishes in New Mexico to the seculars. The number of Franciscans in New Mexico began to decrease rapidly. Unfortunately a sufficient number of qualified secular priests could not be found to take their places. According to Shea there were in 1830 only six secular priests and five Friars in the whole of New Mexico. It is obvious that they could not serve adequately sixty thousand Catholics.

The formal transfer of New Mexico to the United States by treaty in 1848 proved a great blessing to the Church. The country had no college, but few schools, no nuns, and hardly any really educated laymen. Many of its churches were in a dilapidated condition. The vast majority of the laity were ignorant and lacking in zeal, and the Mexican priests laboring in the country were quite incapable of remedying the situation. A bishop was a crying need. Accordingly in 1850, the same year that New Mexico was organized as an American Territory, it was erected into a Vicariate Apostolic by Pope Pius IX. A true episcopal apostle appeared on the scene in the person of Bishop Lamy. A decade earlier the Franciscans had completed their third century of missionary and parochial work in New Mexico. Their work had been done and, making allowance for the inevitable shortcomings found in all long-sustained human endeavors, had been well done. They had converted a pagan nation and formed a Christian colony.

They were able to hand over to their successors a Catholic State numbering as many Catholics as did Canada at the period of the British Conquest.

JOHN J. O'GORMAN.

Ottawa, Canada.

ATHANASIUS AND THE ARIAN CONTROVERSY.

WHEN the last great persecution ceased, Christianity found itself in a world wholly changed. It had spread so widely that it promised to become the leading religious belief of all those contending for the mastery. Each successive effort to subdue it, had only served to show how deeply it was rooted, and how inevitable was the revolution in men's minds, that would at any rate supplant all the partial beliefs of paganism. The last endeavor of the old state religion to crush its aspiring rival had turned out a failure and had alarmed the persecutors far more than the persecuted sect. A certain fatality seemed to hang over all who put their strength to stay this irresistible tide. Of the six leagued or rival candidates for dominion, one had laid down his power, and lived, it was said, subject to fits of insanity and gloom — perhaps died of suicide. Two more had been afflicted with diseases which reduced them to supplicate the prayers of those whom they had sought to exterminate. One, by a submissive alliance, still kept the Empire of the East. One only, had ended his days in peace and honor; and his son Constantine came down with the forces of the North and the West and crushed Maxentius, the last of the tyrants, at the very gates of Rome.

His successs was the assurance, to the Christians, of security at least, and perhaps of dominion. His own imagination had been struck both with the living energy of the Christian faith and with the unhappy end of its oppressors; and while his own conflict lay before him, when he began the hazardous campaign that ended in victory so complete, he yielded to its influence and professed himself its disciple. The cause of paganism was the cause of his bitter personal foes. When a young man, he had barely escaped with his life, by long and hard riding, from the suspicious and cruel court of Galarius,

at Milan. And while he was meditating now, which of the rival dieties should be his patron, a great light shone about him, and in the heavens, near noon, appeared a flaming cross bearing the motto, "In this sign conquer." Instructed by a dream in the meaning of the vision, he hung his imperial banner on a staff in the form of a cross; above, was a golden crown bearing the sacred inscription of Christ. This was the banner he bore when he met the brutal and superstitious tyrant who represented the old religion of Rome, and was kept long after as a precious relic in his imperial city.

The world was changed; and the character of the government was no longer what it had been. Rome no longer

> Sat on her seven hills,
> And from her throne of beauty ruled the world.

She had long been only one of the rival cities of a great empire. Emperors of foreign birth, to be more free of the old institutions of the city, had made their residence elsewhere. Constantine determined to found a great central city; and so Constantinople was built, where the old town of Byzantium had stood, on the narrow channel that divided Europe from Asia. In magnitude it should surpass every other, as became the imperial city. It was a new city; and the new religion found a home here. The first act of Constantine had been to declare perfect toleration — to put Christianity on a level with other forms of faith.

The Christian religion had now thoroughly established itself in the world, and feared no molestation or hindrances from its foes without. And now one should think that it might go on, free and unencumbered, to make the kingdoms of this world the kingdom of God; it might carry out completely the highest Christian idea of truth and justice. But with the change of circumstances came what an explosion of long-smothered bitterness, the opening of a new channel of old animosities. The very first years of Constantine were marked by a great controversy that rocked Christendom to its centre — equal in bitterness, and far superior in fame to any that have happened since, unless it be the so-called Reformation of the sixteenth century. It had been the custom almost from the first to engage the popular mind in the most abstruse discussions of the Divine Nature. It was Tertullian's boast that the

most ignorant Christian was furnished with a reply to questions which the wisest pagan could not answer. The Christian formula which unites the names of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit had given occasion to every variety of interpretation. About the time of Origen's death, Sabellius had defined it as signifying that the Infinite God, one and undivided in Himself, is made known to our imperfect reason in these several relations, or by these several names which express no real distinction in the Godhead, but are simply His method of meeting, half-way as it were, the intellectual and religious wants of His children. This easy, religious exposition was presently known by the odious name of the Sabellian heresy. But the stricter explanations of the doctrine had not yet been brought into a complete and satisfactory form.

It happened that about five or six years after the persecution had ceased, the matter came up for discussion among the clergy of Alexandria, still as of old, the headquarters of religious controversy. And while Alexander the Bishop was expounding with zeal and emphasizing his view of the doctrine, he was suddenly interrupted. Arius, a man of restless, impatient and ambitious temper, who had already taken sides against the Bishop in some party matter, and had with some difficulty been reconciled with the Church, startled him all at once with the charge of heresy. The doctrine, he said, was the doctrine of Sabellius. A pertinacious dispute arose, in which the Bishop was no little embarrased. The dispute seemed to be as much personal as theological. No one could have guessed how great a fire so small a spark could kindle. The point was one which lay wholly beyond the bounds of human reason. The one assertion of Arius was, that if the Son was begotten by the Father, there must have been a time when He began to be, and of course a previous time when He was not; and to this assertion Arius held steadfastly, admitting everything else, even the consequences that seemed in theory to dishonor Christ, by allowing that it was within the range of possibility that He should sin — but protesting all the time the fullest belief in His divinity, and His actual perfection. The one answer of His opponents was that the generation of the Divine Word is of the same sort as that of light from the sun, essential to its very nature; and that to deny the eternity of

the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity is the same as to say that God existed once without His attributes of wisdom and love. And this again to Arius was sheer Sabellianism.

So the great controversy began. Each party sought to strengthen itself by the names of men eminent in the Church. Alexander easily gained the larger number to his side; for granting the merit of both to be equal, he had for him, besides his superior official standing, all that undefined reverence that attaches itself to the name of Christ, which is so much stronger than the bare intellectual reasoning, to plead for either party. Arius was accordingly condemned by all the clergy of the West, suspended from his priestly duties, and compelled to fly from Alexandria. But he found an ally in the speculative, word-splitting disposition of the East, and several of the most distinguished bishops there took sides with him. The dispute went on year after year, and rather gained than lost in bitterness. It came even to the ears of Constantine, who wrote a letter in his own name addressed to both of the combatants — a letter full of plain, good sense and candor, not professing to decide the merits of the case, but urging them not to suffer the peace of the Church to be broken for so small a matter as it must needs seem to him.

Still the rage of controversy was unslackened. Cities and villages had their several factions; families were divided in unrelenting feuds, and the bishops and priests themselves took sides. The pagans who had begun to respect the political influence of Christianity wondered at this division of opinion and the acrimony displayed on both sides. At length, weary of the conflict which seemed no nearer its end as time passed, there was a feeling that only a General Council would settle the question once for all. Accordingly the Pope called a council of the bishops of the world to meet at Nice, and in some respects it was one of the most remarkable assemblies ever gathered, both from the circumstances under which it met, and from the character of the men composing it. Three hundred and eighteen bishops were gathered there. They came maimed, blind, and disfigured with ghastly burns and scars from the tortures inflicted upon them by the insolent Maximin. And so bruised and mutilated — this man wanting an eye, and that, an arm or a leg, it seemed to those present that they were

veteran soldiers, who having served out their term were summoned once more to fight yet another battle for the faith. Arius was also there, and his famous antagonist, Athanasius, a small man in person and young, but of keen mind and indomitable will, ardent, positive and unflinching, zealously devoted to what he thought the truth — one of the younger clergy of Alexandria, and far the ablest, whom Alexander had sent to be his spokesman.

The council was in session two months, busy with discussions. "It was like a battle by night," says one of the old historians, "so little could either party know the ground they fought on." According to one account, when the opinions of Arius were read, the assembly stopped their ears with horror. At length a test word was fixed on, a Greek word which was afterward rendered by the Latin word "consubstantial". It signifies, *same in being or essence.* But it was found so indefinite, after all, that many of the Arians who at first rejected it as Sabellian, afterward accepted it for the sake of peace. Anathemas were appended for those who should refuse this faith.

Constantine came in state, on a set day, to ratify by imperial authority the council's decision. Some few in the assembly scrupled at the language of the Creed; others, at the anathema appended; but he had no idea of leaving it an open question in his empire, after all this care to settle it. To refuse was rebellion against his authority; and as subjects he commanded them to sign. Upward of three hundred signed. Some under protest as to special parts. Some few were banished, among them Arius himself who absolutely refused to sign. And so to all men the great controversy seemed at an end. Athanasius stood forth, as the great defender of the faith; and when Alexander died, he was received with enthusiasm as bishop in his place.

Those who looked more carefully, however, saw that the storm had lulled only for a season. Within two years the Arian party began to come into favor. Constantia, sister of the emperor had been strongly influenced by a bishop of that party and on her deathbed she entreated her brother to restore the banished Arius. Constantine gave the order, but Athanasius refused, standing on his superior right as bishop of the Church. And then began the extraordinary contest that

was waged during the larger part of forty years between imperial power on the one hand, backed by the authority of the realm, and the Church on the other, represented by the indefatigable Athanasius. He relied on his mind, his right, and his people's love. He courted no favor and shunned no reproach. In his administration he was of a stern and uncompromising temper, but his people's verdict was that he was scrupulously just. The party hostile to him took advantage of the emperor's displeasure and tried to crush him by their accusations. He was charged with peculation and fraud, with sacrilege and murder — the murder of a man whom his enemies had hidden for two years, to give color to their charge. The other accusations of faults in official conduct he answered shortly and proudly. When charged with the murder of Arsenius — the proof being a human hand which they said was from the body of the slain man and used by Athanasius in magic rites — he disdained a direct reply. Leading forth a man muffled in a cloak, he asked: "Does anyone here know Arsenius?" He was well-known to many. The man's head was then uncovered; and to their amazement and shame, Arsenius stood before them. Lifting then the cloak on either side, he displayed, first the right hand and then the left. "Had Arsenius three hands?" he asked scornfully. His adversaries could say no more. But on another charge — that of breaking the sacred vessels of an heretical church, without much more weight of evidence — they deposed him from his bishopric, which was all they had the power to do.

Anthanasius was not quelled even then. He went direct to Constantinople to demand a hearing of the emperor. Knowing that a petition from a dishonored man would have no favor, he threw himself in his way, in some procession of state, and loudly demanded justice. Constantine ordered the cause to be tried before him. But a new charge was cunningly got up, which touched his weakest point, his pride and interest in the new capital. Athanasius, it was said, had boasted that his influence was great enough in Alexandria to starve out the capital by keeping back the supplies of corn. Constantine's jealousy was roused; he was already persuaded that Athanasius was of a turbulent spirit, fierce, imperious, arrogant, revengeful and incapable of being quiet. To be clear of so dangerous a subject, he banished him to Trier in Gaul.

Constantine, who had exiled Arius, now recalled him, exacted from him a solemn adhesion to the Nicene faith, and determined that he should be restored to the Church. Arius obeyed with some misgiving, and a day was set for his restoration in Alexandria. The bishop protested bitterly, and prayed God that one or the other of them might die before that day. The very day before, Arius died, in a manner so sudden and so strange that his enemies declared it a miracle.

Athanasius was recalled and exiled four times during the reigns of succeeding emperors. "The treatment we have undergone," says Athanasius, "surpasses the bitterness of any persecution; such deeds have been committed as were never heard of before in all the world, or the like experienced by any one." Julian the Apostate had wished that all the Church were united in this man's single person, that he might destroy it more easily. Twice Athanasius had taken refuge in the West, in Gaul or Rome; and the third time, he sought the shelter of the wilds near Thebes. He suffered a fifth exile, having to retreat from the anger of Julian's Arian successor and to hide himself four months in his father's sepulchre. But here the long story of his wandering and peril ended. He returned after his short banishment to Alexandria and dwelt there in peace for eleven years. He died at the age of seventy-six.

The biography of Athanasius for this long struggle of about fifty years is almost the history of the Church during that period. It is one long controversy, in which he is the champion and the centre of the fight. His intellect did more than any other to shape the thought that was to prevail and rule men's minds so many centuries. The unconquered spirit with which he maintained his post did more perhaps than anything else to give strength and consistency to the organization of the Church. From his time Arianism rapidly declined. When he had been dead about fifteen years, Theodosius, then sole emperor, put forth his power to crush paganism and heresy together. When the Lombard kingdom in Italy was overthrown, Arianism had no longer a name in history. As we look back on that great conflict, we seem to see these two results brought about by the victory which Athanasius gained — each result being of far greater moment to ourselves than might first appear.

First, in the defeat of the Arian party, Christianity was saved from being a mere political or speculative sect. Such, so far as we can see, was the essential character of that party. It began with quibbling and disputatious wrangling about words; it did not engage the better religious feeling of Christendom, and its strength lay in the alliance with the state. The Catholic faith on the other hand was a very positive and explicit faith, its terms not fully understood by the intellect, as must always be with statements respecting the highest truth, but resting before all definitions, on the religious reverence with which the highest must ever be apprehended. Its defence lay in the intrepidity of a single man, whose sole strength was his ardent and uncompromising faith; the only man who dared openly to defy the emperor's will. Athanasius was very far from being eminent among the intellectually great. In keenness of mind and liberal culture he was far inferior to Origen in the age before; in fervor and earnest sentiment, to Augustine in the age succeeding; in compass and breadth and depth of thought, he cannot be compared with the multitude of modern expounders of Christianity. His temper toward his adversaries was hard; it would be difficult to find a line in his writings, of tenderness or strong emotion; few of his arguments are such as any one now would care to answer. But he was eminently the man of his time. He was well acquainted with the way of impressing men's imagination and sense of reverence — a man of marvelous executive skill and energy. It is force of will, not force of thought, that one finds prominent in his writings, as in his life. And that force of will it was which seemed to be required then, to put in shape the vaguer thought of other men, and to stamp on the great Christian movement the character which there and then it was essential it should bear. At this distance we may see and acknowledge thus much in the result effected by so noble and dauntless a champion of the truth.

And secondly, the ruling influence in giving shape and energy to Christianity was forever vindicated for the West. The triumph of Athanasius was the triumph of Rome. The Church in the West would henceforth be regarded as the stronghold of Catholic faith. It had stood firm for Athanasius against the threats of power; it was the refuge of his

successor, Peter, when his chair was disputed by an Arian rival; it claimed its position as the preëminent seat of right opinion. The moral interest of Christian history is henceforth found in the Western Church. And we find through revolution and change, through the rise and decline of nations, through scenes of violence, intolerance and crime, through the perpetual struggle of right against wrong, and truth against error, how God so strengthened and equipped His Church that it should bear through the long journey the ark of the covenant of His Love.

F. JOSEPH KELLY

Detroit, Michigan

Analecta

SACRA CONGREGATIO RITUUM.

I.

St. Jerome Æmilian Declared Patron of Orphans and Waifs.

Quarto a condita Somaschae Congregatione recurrente saeculo, orphanorum numero ob recentes publicas exortas calamitates fere ubique gentium maximopere aucto, ut caeleste praesidium illis pueris puellisque parentibus orbatis et rebus omnibus indigentibus praesto sit, Praepositus generalis Ordinis Clericorum Regularium a Somascha, collecta undique vota quamplurimorum Antistitum humillime Sanctissimo Domino nostro Pio Papae XI obtulit simulque supplicavit, ut Sanctus Hieronymus Aemiliani, qui primus pro colligendis orphanis instituta construxit, et protector et pater orphanorum iam in ipsa liturgica prece vocatur, suprema Sua auctoritate orphanorum Patronus universalis et Adiutor constituatur. Sanctitas porro Sua, referente subscripto Sacrae Rituum Congregationis Secretario, oblata vota peramanter excipiens, Sanctum Hieronymum Aemiliani orphanorum et derelictae iuventae Patronum universalem eligere ac declarare benigne dignata est. Contrariis non obstantibus quibuscumque.

Die 14 Martii 1928.

✠ A. Card. Vico, Ep. Portuen. et S. Rufinae,
S. R. C. Praefectus.

L. * S.

Angelus Mariani, *Secretarius.*

II.

St. Teresa of the Child Jesus Declared Patroness (Equally with St. Francis Xavier) of Missions.

Quam laeto animi sensu fideles universi canonizationem Sanctae Teresiae a Iesu Infante exceperint, divulgata per orbem devotio manifeste demonstrat, cum vel apud ipsas infidelium dissitas regiones Carmelitis Virgo promissum rosarum imbrem e caelo dimittere non praetermiserit. Qua de causa, innumeri Sacrorum Antistites maiores percipi posse fructus in dominica vinea persenserunt, si Sancta Teresia a Iesu Infante, quae maximo flagrabat ardore et zelo dilatandae fidei, cuiusque miraculosos in paganis plagis effectus omnes norunt, caelestis Patrona omnium Missionariorum, in quibusvis Missionibus laborantium declaretur; et ideo Sanctissimo Domino Nostro Pio Papae XI collectas undique preces humillime obtulerunt ut communibus votis suprema Apostolica sanctio accederet. Sanctitas porro Sua, referente infrascripto Domino Cardinali Sacrae Rituum Congregationi Praefecto, postulationibus Antistitum ingenti numero oblatis benignissime obsecundans, declarare dignata est Sanctam Teresiam ab Infante Iesu, peculiarem Missionariorum omnium, sive virorum, sive mulierum, necnon Missionum in toto orbe exsistentium Patronam aeque principalem cum S. Francisco Xaverio, cum omnibus iuribus et privilegiis liturgicis quae huic titulo conveniunt. Contrariis non obstantibus quibuscumque. Die 14 Decembris 1927.

✠ A. Card. Vico, Ep. Portuen. et S. Rufinae,
S. R. C. Praefectus.

L. * S.

Angelus Mariani, *Secretarius.*

III.

Changes in Office and Mass of St. Teresa of Child Jesus.

Sixth Lesson concludes: " Quam Pius Undécimus, Pontifex Máximus, Beátis Virginibus adscriptam, et biennio post, jubiláeo máximo recurrénte, inter Sanctas relátam, peculiárem ómnium Missiónum Patrónam constítuit ac declarávit ".

Third Nocturn has the following Proper Lessons:

Léctio sancti Evangélii secundum Matthéum. *Cap.* **18,** *1-4.*—In illo témpore acessérunt discipuli ad Jesum, dicéntes: Quis putas major est in regno caelórum? Et réliqua.

Homilía S. Leónis Papae. *Sermo 37, in Epiph. solemn.* 7, cap. 3.—Tota, dilectíssimi, christiánae sapiéntiae disciplína, non in abundántia verbi, non in astútia disputándi, neque in appetítu laudis et glóriae, sed in vera et voluntária humilitáte consístit, quam Dóminus Jesus Christus ab útero Matris usque ad supplícium Crucis pro omni fortitúdine et élegit et dócuit. Nam, cum discípuli ejus inter se, ut ait Evangelista, disquírerent quis éorum major esset in regno caelórum vocávit párvulum, et státuit eum in médio eórum, et dixit: Amen, dico vobis, nisi convérsi fuéritis et efficiámini sicut párvuli, non intrábitis in regnum caélórum. Quicúmque ergo humiliáverit se sicut puer iste, hic major erit in regno caelórum. Amat Christus infántiam, quam primum et ánimo suscépit et córpore. Amat Christus infántiam, humilitátis magistram, innocéntiae régulam, mansuetúdinis formam. Amat Christus infántiam, ad quam majórum dírigit mores, ad quam senum redúcit aetátes; et eos ad suum inclinat exémplum, quos ad regnum sublimat aetérnum.

Lectio VIII.—Ut autem plene valeámus agnóscere quómodo apprehéndi possit tam mira convérsio et in puerilem gradum qua nobis mutatióne redeúndum sit, dóceat nos beátus Paulus et dicat: Nolíte pueri éffici sénsibus, sed malítia párvuli estóte. Non ergo ad lúdicra infántiae et imperfécta nobis primórdia reverténdum est, sed áliquid, quod etiam graves annos déceat, inde suméndum, ut velox sit commotiónum tránsitus, citus ad pacem recúrsus: nulla sit memória offensiónis, nulla cupíditas dignitátis; amor sóciae communiónis, aequálitas naturális. Magnum enim bonum est nocére non nosse et maligna non sápere; quia inférre ac referre iniúriam, mundi hujus pruténtia est; némini autem malum pro malo réddere, christiánae est aequanimitátis infántia.

Lectio IX.—Ad hanc vos, dilectíssimi similitúdinem parvulórum mystérium hodiérnae festivitátis invítat; et hanc vobis humilitátis formam adorátus a Magis puer Salvátor insínuat: qui, ut imitatóribus suis quid glóriae paráret, osténderet, ortus

sui témpore éditos martyrio consecrávit: ut in Béthlehem, ubi Christus natus est, géniti, per communiónem aetátis consórtes fíerent passiónis. Amétur ígitur humílitas, et omnis a fidélibus vitétur elátio. Alter álterum sibi praeférat, et nemo quod suum est quaerat, sed quod altérius; ut, cum in ómnibus abundáverit afféctus benevoléntiae, in nullo virus inveniátur invidiae: quóniam qui se exáltat humiliábitur, et qui se humíliat exaltábitur, eodem ipso testánte Jesu Christo Dómino nostro, qui cum Patre et Spiritu Sancto vivit et regnat Deus in saécula saeculórum. Amen.

Te Deum laudámus.

Pro festo commemorato legenda juxta Rubricas Lectio IX.— Terésia a Jesu Infánte, Alensónii in Gallia, ex honéstis piísque paréntibus orta est. Quinto aetátis anno, matre amíssa, Dei providéntiae se totam commísit sub vigilántia amantíssimi patris et sorórum natu majórum: quibus magístris, ad curréndam perfectiónis viam ut gigas exsultávit. Novénnis virgínibus ex Ordine sancti Benedícti Lexóviis excolénda tráditur. Décimo aetátis anno, arcáno et gravi morbo diu cruciáta, ope Dóminae nostrae a Victória, divínitus fuit liberáta. Angélico fervóre repléta, ad sacrum convívium accédens, insatiábilem hujus cibi famem hauríre visa est. Carmelitárum Excalceatórum Ordinem íngredi cúpiens, ob aetátis defectum, multas ad religiósam vitam amplecténdam nacta est difficultátes, quibus fórtiter superátis, Lexoviénsem Carmélum, quindecim annos nata, felíciter ingréssa est: ibíque erga Deum et próximum exímia caritáte flagrávit. Spirituálem infántiae viam, secúndum Evangélii doctrínam, secúta, álios, speciátim novitias, eámdem edócuit. Patiéndi desidério inflammáta, duobus ante óbitum annis Dei miseréntis amóri se víctimam óbtulit. Víginti quátuor annos nata, die trigésima Septémbris, anno millésimo octingentésimo nonagésimo séptimo, ad Sponsum evolávit. Quam Pius Undécimus, Póntifex Máximus, Beátis Virgínibus adscríptam, et biénnio post, jubilaéo máximo recurrénte, solémniter inter Sanctos relátam, peculiárem ómnium Missiónum Patrónam constítuit atque declarávit.

Vespere de sequenti. Commemoratio praecedentis.

ELOGIUM MARTYROLOGIO ROMANO INSERENDUM. *Die 30 Septembris (tertio loco).* — Lexóvii, in Gállia, Sanctae Terésiae a Jesu Infánte, ex Ordine Carmelitárum Excalceatórum; quam vitae innocéntia et simplicitáte claríssimam, Pius Undécimus, Póntifex Máximus, Sanctárum Virginum albo adscrípsit, peculiárem ómnium Missiónum Patrónam declarávit, eiusque festum quinto nonas Octobris recoléndum esse decrévit.

Die 3 Octobris (primo loco).—Sanctae Terésiae a Jesu Infánte, Vírginis, ex Ordine Carmelitárum Excalceatórum, peculiáris ómnium Missiónum Patrónae, cuius dies natális pridie kaléndas Octóbris recensétur.

MISSA PROPRIA—*Introitus, Cant. 4, 8-9.*—Veni de Líbano, sponsa mea, veni de Líbano, veni; vulnerásti cor meum, soror mea sponsa, vulnerásti cor meum. Ps. 112, 1, Laudáte, púeri, Dóminum: laudáte nomen Dómini. Glória Patri.

Oratio.—Domine, qui dixísti: Nisi efficiámini sicut párvuli, non intrábitis in regnum caelórum: da nobis, quáesumus; ita sanctae Terésiae Vírginis in humilitáte et simplicitáte cordis vestígia sectári, ut praemia consequámur aetérna: Qui vivis.

Léctio Isaíae Prophétae. — *Isai., 66, 12-14.* — Haec dicit Dóminus: Ecce ego declinábo super eam quasi fluvium pacis, et quasi torréntem inundántem glóriam géntium, quam sugétis: ad úbera portabimini, et super génua blandientur vobis. Quómodo si cui mater blandiátur, ita ego consolábor vos, et in Jerusalem consolabímini. Vidébitis, et gaudébit cor vestrum, et ossa vestra quasi herba germinábunt, et cognoscétur manus Dómini servis ejus.

Graduale, Matth. 11, 25, Confíteor tibi, Pater, Dómine caeli et terrae, quia abscondisti haec a sapiéntibus et prudéntibus, et revelásti ea párvulis. v. *Ps.* 70, 5, Dómine, spes mea a juventúte mea.

Allelúja, allelúja, *Eccli.* 39, 17-19, Quasi rosa plantáta super rivos aquárum fructificáte: quasi Libanus odórem suavitátis habéte: floréte, flores, quasi lilíum, et date odórem, et frondéte in grátiam, et collaudáte cánticum, et benedícite Dóminum in opéribus suis. Allelúja.

Post Septuagesimam, omissis Allelúja et versu sequenti, dicitur:

Tractus Cant., 2, 11-12, Jam hiems tránsiit, imber ábiit, et recéssit. *v.* Flores apparuérunt in terra nostra, tempus putatiónis advénit: vox túrturis audita est in terra nostra. V. *Jer. 31, 3,* In caritáte perpétua diléxi te: ídeo attráxi te, míserans tui.

Tempore autem Paschali omittitur Graduale, et eius loco dicitur:

Allelúja, allelúja. *v. Eccli. 39, 17-19,* Quasi rosa plantáta super rivos aquárum fructificáte: quasi Líbanus odórem suavitátis habéte: floréte flores, quasi lilíum et date odórem, et frondéte in grátiam, et collaudáte cánticum, et benedícite Dóminum in opéribus suis. Allelúja. *v. Ps. 33, 9; 99, 5,* Gustáte, et vidéte quóniam suávis est Dóminus: in aetérnum misericórdia ejus. Allelúja.

✠ Sequéntia sancti Evangélii secúndum Matthaeum. *Matth. 11-14.*

In illo témpore: Accessérunt discipuli ad Jesum, dicéntes: Quis, putas, major est in regno caelórum? Et ádvocans Jesus párvulum, státuit eum in médio eórum, et dixit: Amen dico vobis, nisi convérsi fuéritis, et efficiámini sicut párvuli, non intrábitis in regnum caelórum. Quicúmque ergo humiliáverit se sicut párvulus iste, hic est major in regno caelórum.

Offertorium Luc. 1, 46-48 et 49, Magníficat ánima mea Dóminum: et exsultávit spiritus meus in Deo salutári meo: quia respéxit humilitátem ancíllae suae: fecit mihi magna qui potens est.

Secreta.—Sacrifícium nostrum tibi, Dómine, quaésumus, sanctae Terésiae Vírginis tuæ precátio sancta concíliet: ut in cujus honóre solémniter exhibétur, ejus méritis efficiátur accéptum. Per Dóminum nostrum.

Communio. Deut. 32, 10-12, Circumdúxit eam, et dócuit: et custodívit quasi pupíllam óculi sui. Sicut áquila expándit alas suas, et assúmpsit eam, atque portávit in húmeris suis. Dominus solus dux ejus fuit.

Postcommunio. — Illo nos, Dómine, amóris igne caeléste mystérium inflámmet: quo sancta Terésia Virgo tua se tibi pro homínibus caritátis victimam devóvit. Per Dóminum nostrum.

IV.

Office and Mass of Curé d'Ars.

Die 9 Augusti; Beati Joannis Mariae Vianney, Confessoris. Duplex (m. t. v.).

In I Vesperis.—*Oratio*—Omnípotens et miséricors Deus, qui sanctum Joánnem Maríam pastoráli stúdio et jugi oratiónis ac poeniténtiae ardóre mirábilem effecísti: da, quáesumus, ut ejus exémplo et intercessióne, ánimas fratrum lucrári Christo, et cum eis aetérnam glóriam cónsequi valeámus. Per eumdem Dóminum.

In II Nocturno: *Lectio IV.*—Joánnes María Vianney, in pago Dardilly Dioecésis Lugdunénsis piis rurículis ortus, ab infántia plura dedit sanctitátis indícia. Cum octénnis oves custodíret, modo puérulos, ad imáginem Deíparae genufléxos, Rosárium verbo et exémplo edocére, modo soróri vel álteri commísso grege, secretiórem locum pétere solébat, quo expeditior ante simulácrum Vírginis oratióni vacáret. Páuperum amantíssimus, eos turmátim in patris domum dedúcere et omnímodo adjuváre in delíciis habébat. Lítteris imbuéndus, párocho vici Ecully tráditus est; sed ut erat tardióris ingénii, in stúdiis fere insuperábiles expértus est difficultátes. Jeiúnio et oratióne divínam opem implorávit, et facilitátem discéndi rogatúrus, túmulum Sancti Francísci Regis, stipem quáeritans, adívit. Theologíae currículo operóse confécto, satis idóneus invéntus est, qui sacris initiarétur.

Lectio V. — In pago Ecully, praeeúnte párocho, cujus vicárius renunciátus fúerat, potióres pastorális perfectiónis gradus totis víribus attíngere conténdit. Elápso triénnio, in viculum Ars, qui non ita multo post dioecési Bellicénsi adscríptus est, quasi Angelus de caelo fuit missus et omnino squaléntis ac desértae suae paróeciae fáciem florentíssime renovávit. In consciéntiis judicándis ac moderándis ad plúrimas horas quotídie assíduus, frequéntem Eucharistíae usum invéxit, pias sodalitátes instaurávit: mirum autem in modum téneram in Immaculátam Vírginem ánimis pietátem índidit. Ratus vero pastóris esse, flagítia concréditae plebis expiáre, nec orationibus, nec vigíliis, macerationibus et contínuis jejúniis parcébat. Tantam viri Dei virtútem cum Satan ferre non posset, eum

vexatiónibus primum, dein apérto certámine adórtus est; sed atrocissimas afflictiones patiénter tolerábat Joánnes María.

Lectio VI.—Invitabátur sáepius a curiónibus vicínis ut, Missionariórum more, animárum salúti, qua concionándo, qua confessiónes excipiéndo consúleret et síngulis praesto semper erat. Stúdio glóriae Dei incénsus, effécit, ut pia Missiónum exercítia in ámplius centum paróeciis, constitúto perpétuo censu, instituerántur. Inter haec, Deo servum suum miráculis et charismátibus illustránte, orta est célebris illa peregrinátio, qua, per vicénnium centum fere míllia hóminum cujúsque órdinis et aetátis, quotánnis Ars conflúxerint non solum e Gálliae et Európae, sed etiam Américae díssitis provínciis. Labóribus pótius quam sénio consúmptus, praenuntiáto suae mortis die, in ósculo Dómini quiévit, die quarta Augústi, anno millésimo octingentésimo quinquagésimo nono, annos natus tres ac septuagínta. Quem multis clarum miráculis, Pius décimus inter Beatos, Pius vero undécimus inter Sanctos caélites anno sacro adscrípsit, ejúsque festum ad univérsam Ecclésiam exténdit.

In III Nocturno.—*Lectiones de Communi primo loco. Pro festo commemorato legenda juxta Rubricas. Lectio IX.* —Joánnes María Vianney, in pago Dardilly Dioecésis Lugdunénsis, piis rurículis ortus, plura dedit sanctitátis indícia. Cum octénnis oves custodíret, puérulos ad imáginem Deíparae genufléxos, Rosárium, verbo et exémplo edocére solébat, et agris coléndis addíctus, de caeléstibus meditabátur. Páuperum amantíssimus, eos omnímodo adjuváre in delíciis hábuit. Ut erat tardióris ingénii, divína ope imploráta, ac theologíae cursu operóse confécto, dignus hábitus est qui sacris initiarétur. Párochus renuntiátus, omníno squaléntis ac desértae paróeciae fáciem florentíssime renovávit. In consciéntiis judicándis ac moderándis quotidie assíduus, atrocíssimas Sátanae vexatiónes patiénter tolerávit. Pia Missiónum exercítia in ámplius centum paróeciis instituit. Cum autem humíllime de se sentíret, sancto fidélium desidério, in suam paróeciam illum viséndi grátia étiam ex díssitis provínciis accurréntium, se subdúcere conabátur. Laboribus pótius quam sénio confféctus, praenuntiáto suae mortis die, in Dómino quiévit, die quarta Augústi anno millésimo octingentésimo quinquagésimo nono, annos

natus tres ac septuagínta. Quem tot clarum miráculis Pius décimus inter Beátos, Pius undécimus inter Sanctos cáelites, anno sacro adscrípsit. Te Deum.

Vesperae de sequentis cammemoratio praecedentis.

MISSA Os Justi *praeter orationem*: "Omnípotens et miséricors Deus" *ut in Officio.*

IN MARTYROLOGIO ROMANO.—*Die 4 Augusti* (*secundo loco*). —In vico Ars, dioecésis Bellicénsis in Gállia, sancti Joánnis Baptístae Maríae Vianney, Presbyteri et Confessóris, in parochiáli múnere obeundo insígnis, quem Pius Papa Undécimus in Sanctórum númerum rétulit ejusque festum quinto Idus mensis huius agéndum esse constítuit.

Die 9 Augusti (*secundo loco*).—Sancti Joánnis Baptístae Maríae Vianney, Presbyteri et Confessóris, cujus dies natális prídie nonas Augústi recensétur.

SACRA CONGREGATIO DE SEMINARIIS ET DE STUDIORUM UNIVERSITATIBUS.

DEGREE IN CANON LAW FOR LAYMEN.

Quaesitum est a Sacra Congregatione de Seminariis et Studiorum Universitatibus: "Utrum,—habita ratione praescriptionis in Encylica *Pascendi* contentae et declarationis ab eadem Sacra Congregatione redditae die XXIX Aprilis, anno MDCCCCXXVII,—laici, qui statum curriculum in scholastica philosophia antea non elaboraverint, admitti possint ad studium iuris canonici, ut valide lauream consequantur?"

Re delata Ssmo D. N. Pio Pp. XI a R. P. D. eiusdem Sacrae Congregationis Secretario in audientia diei XXIX elapsi mensis Martii, Ssmus, adiunctis omnibus perpensis, respondere dignatus est:

Affirmative.

Romae, e Secretaria Sacrae Congregationis de Seminariis et Studiorum Universitatibus, die 11 Aprilis MDCCCCXXVIII.

CAIETANUS Card. BISLETI, *Praefectus.*

L. * S.

✠ Iacobus Sinibaldi, Ep. Tiberien.
Secretarius.

Studies and Conferences

Questions, the discussion of which is for the information of the general reader of the Department of Studies and Conferences, are answered in the order in which they reach us. The Editor cannot engage to reply to inquiries by private letter.

OUR ANALECTA.

The Roman documents for the month are:

S. CONGREGATION OF RITES declares: 1. St. Jerome Æmilian Patron of Orphans and Waifs; 2. and St. Teresa of the Child Jesus Patroness (equally with St. Francis Xavier) of Missions throughout the world; 3. publishes some variations in Office and Mass of St. Teresa of the Child Jesus, 3 October; 4. gives text of Office and Mass of St. John Baptist Vianney, Curé d'Ars, 4 August.

S. CONGREGATION OF SEMINARIES AND UNIVERSITIES ordains that laymen who have not made the regular course in Scholastic Philosophy may validly attain the degree in Canon Law.

RECORDING THE BAPTISM OF ILLEGITIMATE CHILDREN.

The registration of the baptism of illegitimate children offers peculiar difficulties. Therefore Canon 777 § 2 embodies wise regulations for the recording of the parentage of illegitimate children. Those rules at once protect the good name of all persons by not permitting the unwarranted entry of anyone's name as father or mother of an illegitimate and, if anyone's name is so recorded, they shield the pastor against the danger of exposing himself to the charge of slander.

RECORDING THE MOTHER'S NAME. As a rule there is little difficulty here. For generally speaking the fact that a certain woman is the mother of the baptized infant is well known. If this fact is publicly known, this suffices to warrant entering her as the child's mother. The fact is public, if it is known to several persons, to more than six in a small town, to more than eight in a city, or is at least likely to be spread to so many.[1]

[1] Cf. Canon 2197, n. 1; Gasparri, *De Matrimonio*, 3. ed., (Paris, 1904), n. 260.

In some instances, however, the fact that a woman has given birth to an illegitimate child is cleverly concealed. In such a case it would be unwarrantable to record her name in the baptismal register, even if the pastor should be convinced of the reliability of some particular information. Only if the woman herself demands of the pastor that her name be entered as the mother of the child, may she be so described in the entry of the child's baptism: but she must make this request of her own accord (*sponte*) and either *in writing* or *in the presence of two witnesses.*

RECORDING THE FATHER'S NAME. As a rule the father of an illegitimate child is not so easily detected as is its mother. Therefore the directions for recording the name of the father in the baptismal register differ slightly from those for recording the mother's name. In the first place the pastor may not enter as an illegitimate child's father one who is publicly supposed to be its father; for too frequently such rumors are unfounded.

But the pastor may and must record as the father of an illegitimate child the man who requests it *of his own accord* either *in writing* or *in the presence of two witnesses.*

Against a man's will he should be entered as the father of an illegitimate child, only when he is known as such by a *public authentic document.* Either a civil or an ecclesiastical instrument would suffice for the present purpose. Thus, if a man were found guilty on a paternity charge, a copy of the sentence duly certified by the clerk of the court would justify a pastor in recording that man as the father of the child in question. Would an affidavit suffice? If a man makes an affidavit admitting that he is the father of the child in question, but makes no request to have his name entered in the baptismal register, the pastor should ignore the affidavit when he records the child's baptism. But if to the affidavit the man adds his request (in writing or in the presence of two witnesses) that his name be entered in the baptismal register as the child's father, the pastor must accede to his request, since it fulfills the requirements of Canon 777 §2. On the other hand an affidavit by the mother asserting a certain man to be the father of her illegitimate child will not fulfill the requirements of that canon and must be disregarded.

REASON FOR THESE PROOFS OF PARENTAGE. In the absence of public knowledge as to who is the mother of an illegitimate child, or in the absence of a public authentic document as to who is its father, why does the Church forbid the pastor to enter anyone's name in either relation unless the latter voluntarily requests it in writing or in the presence of two witnesses? This serves a double purpose. On the one hand it should prevent a pastor from hastily and unwarrantedly designating anyone as an illegitimate child's father or mother: thus the Church would forestall defamation. On the other hand it obliges the pastor to shield himself against the danger of being accused, with or without just reason, of having defamed such persons. Therefore if any man or woman requests the pastor to inscribe him or her as the father or mother of an illegitimate child, the written record of this request should be carefully preserved in the archives of the parish as proof of the request, in case this proof should be called for at any time and for any lawful purpose.

RECORDING "UNKNOWN PARENTS". If according to the above rules only one of the parents of an illegitimate child is made known to the pastor, only that one's name will be recorded in the baptismal register. The space for the other parent's name some pastors leave blank. This is not in conformity with the last part of Canon 777 § 2, which ordains that the baptized person should be registered as the child of an "unknown father": this serves a twofold purpose: 1. it indicates that the child is illegitimate; 2. it forestalls any unwarranted entry. The very least that ought to be done is to draw a line through the space to indicate that the omission of the father's name is intentional.

If neither the father nor the mother of a child is known in any of the ways prescribed in Canon 777 §2, the pastor will enter the child as of "unknown parents". This will almost always be necessary in the case of foundlings. However, it must be borne in mind that a child whose parentage is entirely unknown is not for that reason alone to be considered illegitimate, but, until contrary proof is presented, it is presumed legitimate.[2]

[2] Gasparri, *o. c.*, n. 1310.

SOME SPECIAL CASES. The following cases that can arise with some frequency may present a little difficulty as to the manner in which the baptisms are to be recorded. These cases can, however, easily be settled, if Canons 1114-1117 are borne in mind.

A child born more than six months after the celebration of its mother's marriage is presumed to have been conceived in lawful wedlock and, therefore, to be legitimate (Canon 1115 §2). But a child born before six months have elasped from the day of its mother's marriage is presumed to have been *conceived* before her marriage. Nevertheless, if such a child's parents have married before it is born, the child is legitimate and must be recorded as the child of lawfully wedded parents (Canon 1114). Here it will not be out of place to warn every pastor against being party to a falsification of dates with a view to shielding the parents against the record of their sin. Such ill-advised "charity" may easily cause untold difficulties and possibly discredit a pastor's records.

Furthermore, if a child is born within six months after its mother's marriage, the latter's husband is presumed to be its father. However, if he was unaware of her pregnancy at the time of the marriage or especially if he repudiates the child *at once,* the child is considered illegitimate.[3] In such a case the pastor should protect himself by demanding that the husband's repudiation of his wife's child be certified in a manner similar to that required in Canon 777 §2 for the registration of an illegitimate child's father.

A child born of a married woman is always presumed to be the child of its mother's husband. Even though the mother is known to have been guilty of adultery at a time when the conception of this child may have taken place, and even though the mother herself affirm under oath that the child was conceived in adultery, both these points must be disregarded and the child must be considered as begotten by its mother's husband: therefore the child must be presumed legitimate and entered in the baptismal register as the child of its mother's husband. This presumption is so strong that it holds against every claim until it is proved that the mother's husband could

[3] Gasparri, *op. cit.,* n. 1307.

not have begotten the child in question, because he did not cohabit with his wife during *all* that time within which this child may have been conceived. In conformity with the laws of physiology, canon law (as also civil law) determines this period of possible conception from the tenth month to the sixth month prior to the child's birth (Canon 1115). But even though the mother's husband repudiate her child and support his repudiation with claims that he could not have been its father, the pastor will be justified in entering him as the father of his wife's child, unless the fact of her husband's absence were notorious,[4] or unless he at once institute lawful proceedings to prove his contention. But even if the husband had been recorded as the father of his wife's child, this record can be properly corrected when competent ecclesiastical or civil authority decides the question. Finally if a widow gives birth to a child within ten months after her husband's death, it is presumed to be a posthumous child of her deceased husband (Canon 1115 § 2).

EXPRESS MENTION OF ILLEGITIMACY. In entering the baptismal record of an illegitimate child, should the record expressly designate the child as illegitimate? There is never any necessity of making any kind of explicit reference to the fact of illegitimacy and no explicit note of it should be made in the baptismal register. From the entire context of the record the illegitimacy will easily be discerned. For if only the mother's name is mentioned, that suffices to indicate the illegitimacy of her child. When the names of both father and mother are mentioned in the record because the conditions required by Canon 777 § 2 are verified, will it not appear—someone may object—that the child was born of parents who were husband and wife, unless some note indicate otherwise? By no means. For in view of the form of marriage prescribed for all Catholics in Canons 1094-1099, the absence of a marriage between the child's parents will be so manifest as to preclude confusion.

But what about adulterine children? If originally the name of the mother's husband had been entered as the child's father and this is later corrected because the latter proves the illegiti-

[4] E.g., if the mother's husband had been at the front during all the time within which the conception of her child could have taken place.

macy of his wife's child as provided for in Canon 1115, this very correction will testify to the illegitimacy of the child. If on the other hand one other than the mother's husband is entered as the child's father, this entry too will again testify to the illegitimacy of the child.

Finally, what about a child born of parents who are married civilly but not in the eyes of the Church? Here again the fact that the child's parents are not validly married in the eyes of the Church will be sufficiently known to preclude any likelihood of the child's being considered born of a marriage recognized as valid by the Church. On the other hand to designate such a child as illegitimate can expose the pastor to prosecution in civil courts, since civil law recognizes the child as legitimate, the laws of the Church to the contrary notwithstanding. In such cases some pastors add the remark at the entry of the child's baptism that its parents are married only civilly. While this remark will not lay the pastor open to prosecution in civil law, it will inform those who understand the law of the Church on the point of its implication of the child's illegitimacy in the eyes of the Church. But even such a note is superfluous and unwarranted.

It might be asked why explicit mention of the illegitimacy is to be avoided, even though the fact be as manifest as day. The reason is that the baptismal register is intended to preserve only what is absolutely necessary for the completeness of the record. The names of the parents of the baptized person are entered in order the better to distinguish the latter and to trace his relationship. Whenever this cannot be done without some reference to a blemish, the mention of everything derogatory to anyone is to be restricted as much as possible. Therefore to the question whether the word "illegitimi" in Canon 777 § 2 comprises those of every character, including adulterine, sacrilegious and other spurious children, the reply was given in the words of the Roman Ritual (old edition: tit. X, c. 2): "Nomina parentum ita inserenda esse, ut omnis infamiae vitetur occasio." [5]

[5] Pontifica Commissio ad Codicis Canones authentice Interpretandos, 14 July, 1922, ad. VIII, in *Acta Ap. Sed.*, XIV (1922), 528.

SAYING PRAYERS OF RITUAL IN LATIN OR IN ENGLISH.

Qu. What prayers of the Ritual have to be said in Latin and which may be said in the vernacular? Is it allowed to say in English, all the prayers given in English, for instance, in the last edition of *The Priest's New Ritual*, by the Rev. Paul Griffith.

Resp. All the prayers of the Ritual must be said in Latin. It is permitted however to read the translation of certain forms, questions and prayers, as is indicated in Griffith's *The Priest's New Ritual,* but only after the Latin formula has been said. The edification of the people is not, in our opinion, so decidedly secured by the reading of a vernacular text, as by a dignified, accurate, reasonably slow and deliberate performance of the sacred rites. The Latin text well read and ceremonies well performed never fail to impress not only the faithful, but the non-Catholics as well. Instead of looking for "the line of least resistance," all priests should remember that what has edified the people for 1900 years is fully capable of doing so for many more centuries. Let the priest practise the intelligent reading of the venerable Latin forms and the dignified and regular observance of ceremonies, and he will soon realize that edification does not depend so much as is believed on reading prayers in the vernacular.

SUBSTITUTION OF VERNACULAR FOR LATIN AT BAPTISM.

Qu. A recent discussion on ceremonies of Baptism induces me to ask the opinion of the REVIEW in the case given below.

Father Manuel, when baptizing a number of children at one time, uses the following method. He asks the questions *once* in Latin; then repeats the questions in English to each couple of sponsors. At the end when presenting the garment, he says the formula: "Accipe vestem," etc. once in Latin, then repeats it in English while presenting the garment to the rest of the children individually. He does the same while presenting the lighted candle.

Father Vest calls his attention to the fact, that in Rubrics "nihil immutandum esse," even if the purpose in individual cases may be apparently lost, that the rubric "singulariter singulis," refers to the Latin, that asking the questions in the vernacular is only a concession, a practice tolerated with the express stipulation that the Latin must be said by the priest before using the vernacular, and that therefore it were better to omit the vernacular entirely, or ask

the questions in the vernacular once after they have been said in Latin to each couple of sponsors.

Father Manuel retorts that he does not change the rubrics. He complies with the prescription of retaining the Latin language by asking the questions once in Latin, and with the prescription, "singulariter singulis," by repeating them in English for each baptism.

Father Manuel's method saves time and lots of squalling. Can it be supported?

Resp. The vernacular must not, in the administration of Baptism, be substituted for the Latin text. The Sacred Congregation of Rites indeed permits the translation into the vernacular of certain parts of the Ritual, as is indicated in the last edition of *The Priest's New Ritual,* by the Rev. Paul Griffith, but only after the corresponding Latin text has been said. Therefore, if a formula must be repeated, as is the case when several infants are presented for Baptism, it is the Latin form that is obligatorily to be repeated. And if it is desirable "to save time and lots of squalling", why not shorten the ceremony by omitting the repetition of the English translation? Why omit what is prescribed and repeat what is only optional?

CONCLUSION OF FUNERAL SERVICE.

Qu. 1. When the prayer, "Deus cui proprium est misereri semper et parcere," etc. is recited after the "Libera" in a Missa Cantata de Requie, *praesente corpore*, or in a solemn funeral Mass, *praesente corpore*, are the versicles and responses, "Requiem aeternam dona ei Domine, et lux perpetua luceat ei, Requiescat in pace, animae ejus et animae fidelium," etc. also sung? If so, by whom is the "Requiescat in pace" sung, by the celebrant or the deacon of the Mass or the choir.

2. In a Missa Cantata Quotidiana may the choir omit all the stanzas of the "Dies Irae", except, say, the first four and the last one? There is no question here as to the obligation of singing all the stanzas of the "Dies Irae" in an anniversary Mass or a funeral Mass.

Resp. 1. There are various interpretations of the seemingly conflicting directions of the Missal and Ritual on the manner of concluding the funeral service. As described by the Ritual it is a continuous unit, the Ritual traditionally supposing that

the cemetery is the " churchyard ", the absolution (" Libera " and oration " Deus cui proprium ") is chanted in the church, then the procession moves to the burial place chanting " In paradisum ", the antiphon " Ego sum ", and the " Benedictus ", after which the priest chants the verses " Kyrie eleison," etc., the oration " Fac quaesumus ", and the concluding verses, " Requiem aeternam " etc. As is traditionally interpreted and generally observed in this country as well as in Europe, the burial service is divided into two parts, the absolution and the burial proper. This interpretation seems favored by the Roman Missal. After the " Libera " and the oration " Deus cui proprium ", the priest chants the verses " Requiem aeternam " etc. and concludes the absolution. The deacon does not sing " Requiescat in pace ", nor does the celebrant; this verse is sung by the choir. After the absolution has been concluded, there is, as a rule, no procession to the cemetery, which nowadays is habitually situated at a long distance from the church: the celebrant or another priest goes privately to the cemetery and there proceeds to the second part of the ceremony, the burial proper, the antiphon " Ego sum ", the " Benedictus " and concluding verses, habitually *sine cantu*.

2. At all high Masses of Requiem, the " Dies Irae " is to be chanted by the choir in its entirety (S. C. R. 4054, ad 5).

TAKING COMMUNION TO SICK IN CONVENT.

Qu. A priest at the altar about to commence Mass in a convent school gives Holy Communion to Sisters and students, returns to the altar, waits a moment and then, vested for Mass, proceeds with the uncovered ciborium, accompanied by two altar boys, to another portion of the building to give Holy Communion to an invalid Sister. He gives the Blessed Sacrament to her without any preparatory prayer whatsoever. Is this course in violation of the rubrics?

Resp. While for serious reasons it is permitted to administer Holy Communion before or after Mass, the practice is not commendable as not consonant with the doctrine of the Sacrifice and the tradition of the Church. Normally the people should communicate immediately after the priest who offers the Holy Sacrifice and in union with him.

As to the practice of giving Holy Communion to a sick nun in her room as if she were present in the chapel, we trust it is a rare one, for it is entirely wrong. Whenever the Blessed Sacrament is carried to the sick, even if the sick person happens to live in the same house where the chapel is, the rubrics *De Communione Infirmorum* (Chapter IV of the Roman Ritual) must be observed. The ciborium should be covered with the humeral veil, and the prayers prescribed in the Ritual should be said in the sick-room. Such a practice as is described by our correspondent is so contrary to the law and traditions of the Church in the matter that it must be regarded as "corruptela juris" and should be stamped out by the Ordinary.

VEIL BEFORE THE BLESSED SACRAMENT DURING SERMON.

Qu. Am I right when I say that some few years ago, possibly nine or ten years—the copy of a decree was published in which the use of a veil before the Blessed Sacrament while a sermon was being preached was forbidden? Some such admonition came out about that time. In reading over Wapelhorst, I see that the veil is not only to be used, but his words are "apponi debet" (page 308, No. 200). He refers then to D. 3728, 2. Would you kindly put me straight on this? I thank you very much.

Resp. There can be found no decree or "copy of decree" forbidding to veil the Blessed Sacrament during the sermon. On the contrary, the practice of thus veiling the Blessed Sacrament is immemorial, perfectly in accordance with the spirit of the occasion, and sanctioned by the Sacred Congregation of Rites, 10 May 1890, as correctly quoted by Wapelhorst.

TIME AND VESTURE FOR PREACHING FUNERAL SERMON.

Qu. On the occasion of a recent funeral service held in church the priests who took part discussed the question as to when and how the funeral sermon should be preached. One maintained that it should be preached immediately after the Mass, whether *Missa cantata* or *Missa solemnis*, the preacher wearing no vestment except his cassock or religious habit. The others declared that the sermon should be preached at the end of the service (i. e. after the absolution), the preacher wearing the same vestments as during the absolution. Which of these two opinions is the correct one? The majority of priests seem to follow the latter opinion.

Resp. According to the Ceremonial of Bishops (Book II, ch. xi, n. 10) and the Sacred Congregation of Rites (2888, ad 1 et 2), the funeral sermon is not preached after the Gospel, but immediately after Mass before the absolution of the body. The preacher must be vested in cassock or religious habit, but should not wear a surplice or a stole. A secular priest or prelate should wear also the Roman cloak known as *ferraiolo.* (See Nainfa's *Costume of Prelates,* second edition, pages 62-64, 208-209).

PRIESTS AND LAW OF ABSTINENCE ON EMBER SATURDAYS.

Qu. Are priests exempt from the law of abstinence on the Saturdays of ember weeks? Is the ordinary work of a priest on Sundays a sufficient reason for claiming such an exemption?

Resp. We know of no law which specifically exempts a priest from the observance of abstinence on the Saturdays of Ember weeks. These days are days of both fast and abstinence. Since the two obligations are divisible, a person may be excused from the fast and still remain bound by the abstinence. The ordinary work of a priest on Saturdays and Sundays, in the judgment of many conscientious priests, is sufficient to excuse from the law of fasting on Saturdays. Since the law of abstinence entails less hardship than the law of fasting, a more serious reason is demanded to excuse from it. The ordinary work of a priest does not of itself afford that excuse, provided the priest be in normal health. In exceptional cases, a priest in infirm health may find that abstinence unfits him for the work he must do by reason of his office. In that case he is excused, but in this he would act more wisely by following the judgment of his confessor or his ecclesiastical superior.

WHEN MINISTER GENUFLECTS, OR KNEELS, AT FOOT OF ALTAR.

Qu. When a priest is going to give Benediction or give Holy Communion outside of Mass time, should he come to the altar and make a genuflexion only, then go up to the altar; or should he kneel and pray for a while?

In a High Mass should the people stand until the priest has consumed the Precious Blood, or not?

Resp. 1. Kneeling for a short adoration of the Blessed Sacrament on entering the church is an act of private devotion, but not a liturgical prescription. On arriving at the altar for any service, even to give Holy Communion outside of Mass, the priest must simply genuflect on the floor and immediately go up to the altar. The rubrics prescribe a prayer at the foot of the altar only at the beginning of canonical hours; the celebrant is then directed to kneel on the lowest step and privately recite the prayer *Aperi.*

2. At High Mass, the clergy and people should remain standing until the priest has received the Precious Blood. They may sit down when he holds out the chalice for the first ablution.

PRAYERS AFTER LOW MASS.

Qu. The first of the two prayers ("O God, our refuge and our strength") to be said at the foot of the altar after low Mass ends, according to the cards supplied by church goods firms, by "through Christ our Lord". I have heard priests say "through *the same* Christ our Lord". Which is correct?

Resp. The official text of the prayer has in Latin, *per eumdem Christum Dominum nostrum,* which should be translated by "through the same Christ our Lord". The reason is that, in the course of the prayer, the Blessed Virgin is called "Mother of God" (*Dei Genitrix*). We know that whenever God is mentioned as the Son of the Blessed Virgin Mary, Christ is meant, and therefore the conclusion of the prayer in which such formula is used should contain the word "same". When the prayer was first ordered by Pope Leo XIII, the text of the conclusion was indeed "per Christum Dominum nostrum", as Pope Leo, who was not particularly versed in things liturgical, had composed and ordered the prayer himself without consulting the Sacred Congregation of Rites. For a long time the Congregation ignored that prayer altogether as well as all questions asked about it; finally, when the Sacred Congregation relented, the faulty conclusion was duly corrected to "per eumdem Christum Dominum nostrum". That our church goods firms have continued to print the old conclusion is only another proof of the necessity of careful censorship of their productions by the local Ordinaries.

Ecclesiastical Library Table

RECENT PHILOSOPHICAL LITERATURE.

The productivity of philosophers has been immense during the past year or two. Practically every field has been worked over and, in some cases, with surprising results. Historical research, especially in the medieval field, has made notable advances. Pure speculation of a highly technical character seems to be coming into its own again. This is markedly true of Germany where, due to the inspiration of Meinong and Husserl, the number of metaphysical treatises which have issued from the press is astounding.[1] The trend toward Aristotle is marked and, as Professor Leibert has pointed out, the leaning toward certain characteristic principles of Neo-Scholastic metaphysics surprising.

Works of general interest, like *Philosophy Today: Essays on Recent Developments in the Field of Philosophy,* edited by Edward Leroy Schaub (Chicago: Open Court Publishing Co., 1928), *Proceedings of the Sixth International Congress of Philosophy,* edited by Edgar Brightman (New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1928), and Ralph Barton Perry, *Philosophy of the Recent Past* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1926) will serve to orientate the general reader in the field of current discussion and give him a fairly accurate picture of the problems which are engaging the attention of philosophers.

Notable work has been done in ancient philosophy, particularly with reference to Aristotle.[2] Numerous Platonic studies

[1] Otto Janssen, *Vorstudien zur Metaphysik:* 2nd Vol. *Die Frage der Wirklichkeit* (Halle: Niemeyer, 1927); R. Kynast, *Ein Weg zur Metaphysik: Ein Versuch über ihre Moglichkeit* (Leipzig: Meiner, 1927); Walter Ehrlich, *Das unpersonale Erlebnis, Einführung in eine neue Erkenntnislehre* (Halle: Niemeyer, 1927). For a full account of this movement, see J. A. Engert, "Philosophy in Germany During 1927", *The New Scholasticism,* II (1928), 250.

In France there has appeared Louis Lavelle, *La dialectique de l'éternel présent: I. De l'Etre* (Paris: Alcan, 1928); *Où chercher le réel?* (Cahiers de la nouvelle Journée) containing articles by Chevalier, A. Forest, A. Bouyssonie, Legendre (Paris: Bloud and Gay, 1927).

In the United States, "The Problem of Substance", *University of California Publications in Philosophy* (Berkeley, 1927); J. McTaggart, *The Nature of Existence* (New York: Macmillan Co., 1927).

Dr. Gaston Rabeau in his *Réalité et Relativité — Études sur le relativisme contemporain* (Paris: Rivière, 1927) criticizes from a Scholastic point of view the modern doctrines of relativity.

[2] New works are Scoon, *Greek Philosophy Before Plato* (Princeton Univer-

have also appeared, probably the most important of which is the classic by A. E. Taylor, *Plato, the Man and His Work* (New York: Dial Press, 1927). This work is quite generally regarded as definitive, the fruit of over a quarter of a century's study by Professor Taylor of the Master of the Academy.

Medieval philosophy is at last coming into its own. Not only have a great number of studies appeared treating the field as a whole or dedicated to particular thinkers, but a large amount of new material has been unearthed and is in the process of publication. Students are well aware of the changes that have taken place in our estimates of Scotus due to a critical study of his works, some of which formerly ascribed to him now are recognized as spurious. In the general field of the history of medieval philosophy attention is called to the *History of Medieval Philosophy* by Maurice deWulf, translated by Ernest C. Messenger (New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1927), and particularly to the new (11th) edition of Ueberweg-Heinze *Die Patristische und Scholastische Philosophie,* edited by Geyer (Berlin: Mittler, 1928). This latter work contains an exhaustive bibliography on medieval philosophy, the value of which cannot be exaggerated.[3]

Numerous studies have been written on St. Thomas and certain of his works have appeared both in translation and in the original.[4] Important studies on Scotus,[5] as well as a

sity Press, 1928). For Aristotle, M.-D. Roland-Gosselin, *Aristote* (Paris: Flammarion, 1928); H. Carteron, *Aristote, Physique I–IV* (Paris, 1926); H. Rackham, *Aristotle: The Nicomachean Ethics* (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1926). The works of Aristotle, translated by W. D. Ross, London, in course of publication for twenty years, now contains seven volumes.

[3] The series of articles on medieval philosophy now appearing in the *Philosophical Review* (January and May, 1928 to date) by Professor Longwell of Princeton give a sympathetic and appreciative analysis of that period. The work of Rougier, *La Scolastique et le Thomisme,* a fierce attack on Scholasticism, has called forth replies from Gilson, Théry, Descoqs, de Solages, and others. See "Le Procès de la Scolastique" by Bruno de Solages, extract of the *Revue Thomiste,* 1927.

[4] We call attention to Vols. XIII and XIV of the *Opera Omnia* (Leonine Edition) which contains the *Summa Contra Gentiles;* also to *Somme Théologique de St. Thomas: La Création* (I[a], Q. 44-49) by A. D. Sertillanges (Paris: Desclée, 1927); T. Pègues, *Commentaire français littéral de la Somme Théologique* (Paris, 1924); *Summa Theologica, Pars Prima,* edited by Dominicans of Toulouse; a pocket edition (Paris; Blot, 1926); on St. Thomas – A. Dempf, *Die Hautform mittelalterlicher Weltanschauung* (München, 1925); P. Tischleder, *Die Geistesgeschichtliche Bedeutung des heil. Thomas v. Aquin für metaphysik, Ethik, und Theologie* (Freiburg: Herder, 1928); P. Glorieux, *Les prèmieres polémiques thomistes:* I. *Le correctorium corruptorii "Quare"* (Kain: Le Saulchoir, 1927); J. de Guibert, *Les doublets de St. Thomas* (Paris, 1926); P. Man-

critical edition of his works, are in progress. The well-known Franciscan scholar, Father Ephrem Longpré, is now at work on this edition of Scotus. A number of important texts on medieval philosophy, among which we note Volume I of the Quaracchi edition of the *Summa Theologica* of Alexander of Hales, have been published.[6]

A great deal of interest, too, is being shown in medieval mysticism and particularly in Eckhart.[7] Works have also been published on Ockham,[8] of Roger Bacon,[9] and on John Baconthorp.[10]

Contemporary philosophy is turning away from the monism of the last century in the definite direction of a saner and sounder dualism. Materialism and mechanism have been discarded to a large degree, and, in their place, the claims of spiritualistic and vitalistic thought have achieved a recognition which is as widespread as it is gratifying. Such names

donnet, *Sancti Thomae Aquin. Opuscula Genuina,* etc. (Paris, 1926); Edgar de Bruyne, *Saint Thomas d'Aquin* (Paris, Beauchesne, 1928); M.–D. Roland-Gosselin, *Le "De Ente et Essentia" de S. Thomas d'Aquin* (Kain: Le Saulchoir, 1926); A. Van Hove, *La Doctrine du miracle chez S. Thomas et son accord avec les principes de la recherche scientifique* (Paris: Gabalda, 1927).

[5] Ch. Balic, *Les Commentaires de Jean Duns Scot sur les quatre livres des Sentences* (Louvain, 1927); C. R. S. Harris, *John Duns Scotus,* 2 vols. (London, 1927); P. Tochowicz, *Ioannis Duns Scoti de Cognitionis Doctrina* (Freiburg, 1926); J. Kraus, *Die Lehre des Johannes Duns Skotus, O.F.M. von der natura communis* (Freiburg, 1927).

[6] G. Lacombe, *Opera Omnia Prepositini,* Vol. I (Kain: Le Saulchoir, 1927). The Bibliothèque Thomiste, which publishes original studies and texts of medieval writers, is invaluable to all students of philosophy. Among its recent publications we note P. Glorieux, *La Littérature Quodlibétique de 1260 à 1320;* G. Théry, *David de Dinant;* G. Théry, *Alexandre d'Aphrodise;* J. Daguillon, *Ulrich de Strasbourg, La Summa de Bono,* Books I and II. Books III and IV, together with a biography, are promised; also studies on Philip the Chancellor, Stephen Langton, and Robert de Courçon.

[7] E. Longpré, "Questions inedits de Maître Eckhart O.P. et de Gonzalve de Balboa, O.F.M.", *Revue Neo-Scolastique de Philosophie,* February, 1927; M. Grabmann, *Neuaufgefunde Pariser Quaestionen Meister Eckharts und ihr Stellung in seinem geistigen Entwicklungsgauge* (Munich, 1927); see also article on Grabmann's thesis by O. Karrer in *Divus Thomas,* March, 1927; F. Schulze, *Meister Eckharts deutsche Predigten und Traktate* (Leipzig, Insel-Verlag, 1927); D. Dobbins, *Franciscan Mysticism* (New York: Wagner, 1928); J. Connolly, *John Gerson, Reformer and Mystic* (Louvain, 1928); J. A. Spiritu-Sancto, "Enucleatio mysticae Theologiae S. Dionysii Areopagitae", *Carmelitana* (Rome, 1927).

[8] C. K. Brampton, *The De imperatorum et pontificum potestate of William of Ockham* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1927).

[9] R. B. Burke (trans.), *The Opus Majus of Roger Bacon,* 2 vols. (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1928); Robert Steele, *Opera hactenus inedita Rogeri Baconi:* Fasc. VI. *Compotus, etc.* (Oxford, 1926).

[10] B. F. Xiberta, "De Magistro Iohanne Baconthorp, O. Carm.", extract from *Analecta Ordinis Carmelitarum* (Rome, 1927).

as Dilthey, Driesch, Spranger, Klages, Bergson, and Camille represent the movement away from stark materialism and lifeless mechanism in quest of a philosophy which is truly representative of the complexities and pluralities of the universe as modern science presents it to our view.

In Italy a definite and widespread revolt is taking place against the neo-Hegelian ideas of Croce and Gentile.[11] The Neo-Scholastic movement, under the leadership of Gemelli, is showing signs of vigorous life. Its interests seem to lie, principally, in the epistemological and philosophy-of-history fields, due no doubt to the need it feels of meeting neo-Hegelianism on its own ground.[12]

French thought, at least French university thought, is abandoning positivism and the sociological views of the School of Durkheim. It is beginning to show appreciation of the possibilities of the Scholastic synthesis, and signs of a definite rapprochement between university and Scholastic thinkers are in evidence.[13] A number of important works written from the Scholastic angle have appeared, a partial list of which is given below.[14] In Belgium the school founded by Cardinal Mercier continues more than to hold its own and to influence widely the thought of that small but vigorous country.[15] Probably the most important recent work is that of Maréchal, which has now run to four volumes, a magnificent and highly successful effort to rethink Thomism in terms of modern thought.[16]

[11] For a general account of philosophy in Italy see G. Bontadini, "Philosophy in Italy During 1926", *The New Scholasticism,* I (1927), 343.

[12] The following works have appeared: A. Gemelli, *Mio Contributo alla Filosofia Neoscolastica* (Milan, 1926); F. Olgiati, *L'idealismo di Giorgio Berkeley ed il suo Significato Storico* (Milan, 1926); G. Bruni, *Riflessioni sulla Scolastica* (Rome, 1927).

[13] See R. Jolivet, "Le Mouvement Philosophique en France en 1926-1927", *The New Scholasticism,* II (1928), 138. Benrubi, *Philosophisches Stroemungen in Frankreich* (Leipzig, 1928) gives a solid account of French philosophy during the last century. In the Neo-Scholastic School he refers only to Maritain and Gilson.

[14] G. Picard, *La connaissance sensible d'après les Scolastiques;* E. Baudin, *Introduction Générale à la Philosophie* (Paris: Di Gigord, 1927); H. Collin, *Manuel de Philosophie Thomiste* (Paris: Téqui—N. Y. Agent: Ch. Dien, 1926); O. Hobert, *Le Primat de l'intelligence dans l'histoire de la Pensée* (Paris: Beauchesne, 1926); J. Rimaud, *Thomisme et Méthode* (Paris: Beauchesne, 1926).

[15] R. Kremer, "La Philosophie en Belgique en 1926", *The New Scholasticism,* I (1927), 259.

[16] P. Maréchal, *Le point de départ de la Métaphysique* (Louvain: Museum Lessianum, 1927). Volume I, treating of the history of epistemological thought, has recently been issued in a new and revised edition, in order to take account of the researches on Scotus.

A new edition of D. Nys, *Cosmologie,* 2 vols. (Louvain, 1928), has appeared.

Numerous studies have appeared in the field of modern philosophy. It would take too much space to detail them all. Of significance, however, are the appended studies in the philosophy of mind.[17] Reference must be made to the expositions or estimates of modern philosophers given below.[18]

Many works treating of philosophy in general and of particular aspects of philosophical problems continue to make their appearance. The relations between science and philosophy, the validity of the theory of emergent evolution, and the relations of religion to philosophy are the topics most discussed.[19] The tendencies of contemporary thought are not clearly marked as yet. There seems to exist little respect for the older idealisms, while materialism is quite universally regarded as a lost cause. The new theories in physics and the advances made in scientific thought have been of too recent a date to have become assimilated by philosophers. Discussion nowadays confines itself more or less to the question of what are the limits to be put on scientific theories as they affect the metaphysical principles about which philosophers debate. Certainly there is no indication at the present moment that we are to expect in the near future revolutionary changes in the philosophical stand-

[17] C. Spearman, *The Nature of Intelligence and the Principles of Cognition* (2nd ed., New York: Macmillan Co., 1927); *The Abilities of Man: Their Nature and Measurement* (New York: Macmillan Co., 1927); Hans Driesch, *Mind and Body* (Trans. by Besterman, New York: The Dial Press, 1927); J. W. Dunne, *An Experiment with Time* (New York: Macmillan Co., 1927); R. J. S. McDowell (Ed.), *The Mind—A Series of Lectures Delivered at King's College* (New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1927).

[18] C. D. Broad, *The Philosophy of Francis Bacon* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1926; A. E. Taylor, *Francis Bacon* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1927); F. J. Powicke, *The Cambridge Platonists* (London: J. M. Dent and Sons, 1926); Clement C. J. Webb, *Kant's Philosophy of Religion* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1926); W. Haensel, *Kants Lehre von Winderstandrecht* (Berlin: Rolf Heise, 1926); R. Kynast, *Kant: Sein System als Theorie des Kulturbewisstseins* (Munich: Reinhardt, 1928); H. Haldar, *Neo-Hegelianism* (London: Heath Cranton, 1927); Charles De Rouvre, *Auguste Comte et le Catholicisme* (Paris: Rieder, 1928); U. A. Padovani, *Vincenzo Gioberti ed il Cattolicismo* (Milan: Vita e Pensiero, 1927); W. M. Horton, *The Philosophy of the Abbé Bautain* (New York: New York University Press, 1926).

[19] A. N. Whitehead, *Religion in the Making* (New York: Macmillan Co., 1927); *Symbolism, Its Meaning and Effect* (New York: Macmillan Co., 1928); F. H. Bradley, *Ethical Studies* (2nd ed., Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1927); Sidney Hook, *The Metaphysics of Pragmatism* (Chicago: Open Court Publishing Co., 1927); D. Luther Evans, *New Realism and Old Reality* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1928); H. N. Wieman, *The Wrestle of Religion with Truth* (New York: Macmillan Co., 1928); J. E. Turner, *The Nature of Deity* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1927); E. G. Braham, *Personality and Immortality in Post-Kantian Thought* (London: Allen and Unwin, 1926); Edmund Noble, *Purposive Evolution* (New York: Henry Holt Co., 1926); P. W. Bridgman, *The Logic of Modern Physics* (New York: Macmillan Co., 1927).

point. The trend toward realism is most marked both in Europe and in America, and it is from the realistic camp that constructive thinking is looked for.

* * *

It is a comforting thought to realize that in academic circles thinkers are beginning to catch the full significance of medieval thought, and see, too, that it must be linked closely with modern achievement if the latter is to be made in any way intelligible to us. Our civilization did not spin itself out of its own inner consciousness; it has evolved, and its roots lie in the past, but a past much closer to us than ordinarily we imagine.

Professor Longwell, of Princeton, who has studied over a period of years the field of medieval philosophy, is now giving in the pages of the *Philosophical Review* the results of his researches in a series of articles whose first effect will be, among professional philosophers, to do away with the false ideas which most of them have absorbed concerning the Middle Ages from the manuals of history of philosophy. Longwell is convinced that the Middle Ages are the beginning of modern civilization. And he sees in their philosophy "the first real achievement of our modern race in its search for rationalized truth". He has found the key which will open the treasure house of medieval thinking. For centuries its doors have been locked against the unsympathetic and ignorant intrusion of iconoclasts who came not to learn but to sneer and to destroy.

According to Professor Longwell the significance of Scholasticism lies in this, that it was a great adventure in the use of human reason. As everyone knows, religion is found at the basis of all medieval thinking. In those days the doctrines of the Faith were an all-encompassing presupposition for thought, an accepted datum which men did not doubt, but which they reasoned about because they felt that religion had to be made reasonable if it were to endure. Faith fortified by reason and reason uplifted by faith meant for the medieval thinker a rounded world-view, the sublimest achievement of human reason.

The significant aspect of medieval philosophy is that it was philosophy, not theology, and this despite its ever close alliance with theological thinking. It is this all-important fact, so often ignored, that Professor Longwell has grasped. Schol-

asticism, he writes, " represents the first successful use of reason by our modern race, on a grand scale, applied under urgent concern for transcendental values ". The medieval philosophers were true "professionels des ensembles." Pure reason was their guiding star to truth, and they relied on reason not only in their philosophical constructions but in the elaboration of their theological ideas as well. The medieval setting " makes clear a central fact: *religion as foil for developing reason.* Paradoxical, we say. On the contrary, it seems strange that a fact so obvious should fail to deliver its message persistently". Nor need we conclude from this that the philosophers of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries were intellectually dishonest. The very opposite is the truth. Religion held for them the place which moderns accord to science. As out of the sciences have grown the towering thought-systems of twentieth century philosophy, so Scholasticism found in religion the object and source for its deepest speculations. Indeed, " the evidence for scholasticism as the first chapter in the history of modern free thought is so obvious that one wonders how it could have been misread ".

Reason turned toward the truths of faith developed a dialectical method whose weaknesses have often been commented upon, but whose strength has only recently been acknowledged and appreciated. We are accustomed to speak of medieval logic-chopping, formalism, verbal repetition, and do not understand, or pass by without mention, the profoundly mathematical character of its methods, methods which in the hands of Spinoza gained universal applause. Anyone who has studied the *Summa Theologica* can well appreciate its almost mechanical precision in argumentation, as well as its tremendous logical sweep. Grant the foundations upon which this magnificent work rests, and the reasoning proceeds with a gigantic force against which every logical attack is in vain. The geometrical method, it is true, is not a lovely thing, neither can it be expected to give birth to imaginative literature. By its very nature it restricts the literary qualities of a treatise, since its aim is to present us with a naked, unadorned exposition of pure thought. The *Summa Theologica* is about as beautiful as a modern geometry, but who looks primarily for beauty in a work that analyzes transcendental truth? The medieval peo-

ple had their beauty, and to spare: architecture, painting, sculpture, and poetry. In philosophy they sought the truth and, out of three centuries of dialectical discussions, succeeded in evolving a thought instrument which is, as Professor Longwell points out, " the nearest approach yet made to the cold formalism of mathematics, and all who have experienced its spell understand what a truly great achievement it was ".

Professor Longwell pays a number of wonderful tributes to St. Thomas. He cites Huxley who speaks of Aquinas as one " whose marvellous grasp and subtlety of intellect seem to me to be almost without a parallel ". He himself concludes from his reading of Aquinas: " Seeing, therefore, that Plato and Aristotle have endured these many centuries, we need not wonder that Thomas Aquinas also endures. For his synthesis is a reinterpretation of *both* Plato and Aristotle in combination, and it is done in remarkably judicious and balanced fashion, all in the light of that enriched insight which vital religious experience alone enables."

His appreciation of Anselm, too, is no less striking, a thinker who wrote with the insight of another Plato and the fire of a great religious reformer. These medieval philosophers, Abélard, Anselm, Bonaventure, Aquinas, and Scotus, need only be studied with sympathy and understanding in order to discover in them the cold beauty which lies at the bottom of their thought, a beauty so often hidden by the forbidding language and technical apparatus in which it is clothed.

There are certain lights and shadows in the pictures drawn of the development of medieval faith in human reason which all will not see in the same fashion as does Professor Longwell. To my way of thinking, he accords in this process too large a role to Scotus Eriugena, as he over-emphasizes the part played by the heretical sects of the Middle Ages. Certainly the influence of Eriugena should not be minimized, but neither should it be exaggerated. The Irish monks were deeply affected by his pantheism and scattered this philosophy far and wide in their innumerable journeys to and from the Continent. But this interesting chapter in medieval philosophy, which deals with the influence of Scotus, has yet to be written before we can speak with any great assurance of the effect of his philosophy on later thinkers. Again, medieval heretics did compel orthodox thinkers to even renewed efforts in defence

of the Faith. Even as late as the thirteenth century, St. Thomas felt himself compelled to enter the apologetic field with his *Contra Gentiles* directed against unbelievers and his *De Unitate Intellectus*, against the Averroists. But as I read the evolution of philosophical methodology in the Middle Ages, it developed primarily out of the forces latent in Scholasticism itself, helped on, of course, by external influences among which the heretics are to be given a place. The most important external influences, however, came from Arabian and Jewish sources, and it is to Avicenna, Averroes, Maimonides, and others, rather then to Eriugena, that we are to look for the rationalistic strains so prominent in thirteenth century philosophy. This is a field of research, only the surface of which has been scratched in recent years. Professor Asin y Palacios has pointed out its significance and contributed his share of information. Professor Gilson has turned to the Arabians in order to understand Duns Scotus. It is the settled view of many scholars that in the near future ever increasing numbers of students will go in that direction in order to discover the foundations for much of the development of later medieval philosophy.

The modern thinker can learn a great deal from the works of medieval philosophers. It is a noteworthy fact that they are increasingly going to that source for much of their inspiration and guidance. To know ourselves, we must know the Middle Ages; but only those who approach the Middle Ages with seriousness and insight can hope to wrest from them their secrets. Now, a back-to-the-Middle-Ages movement does not mean that we are to give up our faith in modern science and its achievements. Certainly, there is nothing either in logic or experience to prevent us from supplementing faith in science with faith in religion. A reading of medieval philosophers is the best proof that such a synthesis is possible. Professor Longwell has seen that such a need is a crying one. "We need," he writes, "to supplement our faith in science with faith in philosophy and religion." And in order to do this, the first step is to know, and deeply, medieval philosophy, for "the age which created Scholasticism in finished form was also producing Mysticism and shaping Humanism and beginning Science".

JAMES H. RYAN.

The Catholic University of America.

Criticisms and Notes

MEN AND MANNERS IN THE DAYS OF CHRIST. Studies and Character Sketches of the First Century. By J. P. Arendzen, M.A. (Cantab.), Ph.D., D.D. B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis; Sheed & Ward, London. 1928. Pp. 296.

Dr. Arendzen has kept in touch with the critical studies in the Scriptural field which have thrown fresh light upon the history of New Testament times, and which lead to a better understanding of the inspired text upon which the Catholic faith is built. His illustrations are made in the form of separate pictures, of loosely connected themes, called forth by arguments touching the authenticity and credibility of witnesses to the facts of early Christian history. The aim of these essays is both instructive and practical. Thus in discussing the date of Christ's death at a beginning of his interpretations the author argues in favor of a definite settlement of the date of Easter on the first Sunday in April as likely to satisfy the historical claims of the Christian world, and to establish stability in secular matters such as the present variation of the calendar prevents.

Two chapters—the Second Coming of Christ, and the expression of Jewish thought in the Roman Liturgy contained in the references to Abel, Abraham and Melchisedek—offer a patristic analysis of passages in the New Testament about which there has been much controversy in exegetical and theological schools. The remaining fourteen chapters of the volume are chiefly cameo presentations of persons, Jews and pagans, who were contemporary witnesses of the transition from the Hebrew and Gentile world of thought to that of Christ as set forth in St. Paul's teaching. Thus we become familiar with Philo, Seneca, Epictetus, Herod Agrippa, the brother of Herodias who caused the death of St. John the Baptist, Josephus, and the three Sibylline virgins who figure in pagan, Jewish and Christian literature, as reflecting the Messianic image.

While the author's method is in great part polemical, the student of Biblical history will be amply repaid by perusal of the volume as a supplement to apologetic and Biblical study. Books of this sort are in order just now and might well replace some of the old-fashioned didactic introductions to Scriptural history which have no bearing on modern thought.

READINGS IN FIRST CORINTHIANS. Church Beginnings in Greece. By C. Lattey, S.J., M.A., New Testament Professor at Heythrop College, Chipping Norton, Oxon. B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis and London. Pp. 210.

Father Lattey, S.J., has done such excellent work in Biblical interpretation and in promoting Scriptural study, as author and as editor, that a new book from his pen at once raises expectations of high value in the inquiring reader. Nor does the present work disappoint the thoughtful student of what may be regarded as the most important Pauline piece of writing, inasmuch as it throws vivid light upon the development of Christianity during the first years of its introduction among the Greeks. The picture of the Apostle of the Gentiles here drawn is not an isolated portrait, but one that fits well into the frame of historical exegesis previously published by the gifted author; for it explains both the doctrine and discipline of the Mystical Body of Christ which the evangelical series of the Westminster Version has had chiefly in view. The author's special attraction in New Testament studies for St. Paul made itself manifest from the very beginning, so that we see the Apostle transfigured throughout in the light of Christ's person and teaching.

The Corinthian metropolis, by reason of its situation and its traditions, became at once an ecclesiastical center of national importance which Hebrew influence was to reach from the East. Jews and Jewish converts to Christianity had sought refuge from Roman persecution in the newly rebuilt thoroughfares, where poverty and virtue were likely to retain an influence despite the prevailing laxity of morals which wealth and luxury brought hither through adventurers from all parts of Asia Minor and of the western empire including the African coast. Here St. Paul found abundant opportunity for the exercise of his talent of teaching, his learning, his courage, and his charity. Two of his canonical Epistles show the intimate relation which he managed to establish between himself as apostle and spiritual guide and the leading representatives of the newly organized church. There is clear evidence, however, as Father Lattey points out, that a number of Apostolic letters were addressed to the Corinthian church which are not accounted for in the inspired Pauline records. It is unnecessary to attach historic importance to the various apocryphal *Acta Pauli* in order to maintain the existence of an undercurrent of truth in many early traditions referred to by Apostolic writers of the first and second centuries. They are supported by indications such as we find in the Catacombs, one example of which is the unmistakably Hebrew likeness of the

Apostle which roughly sketches his features in the frontispiece to the volume.

The present treatise avoids controversial formality and deals with all the leading doctrines of Pauline theology in a way that makes for a ready understanding of its important features as an aid to apologetic instruction. The narrative is agreeably informal. Happily the number of books of this kind is growing. They are calculated to interest the average reader who may have a subtle prejudice against pious books, by a practical application to modern modes of thought. Here we learn to recognize St. Paul in his later as well as his early disciples. St. Francis Xavier and missionaries of to-day reproduce his image, and we feel that the Pauline spirit is still reproduced among the clerical laborers in our great centers of civilization, allowing them to share the title of sanctity with the holy preachers no less than with the cenobites and cloistered contemplatives of the Apostolic age.

A CATHOLIC VIEW OF HOLISM. By Monsignor Kolbe (University of Cape Town). New York: The Macmillan Company. 1928. Pp. 103.

This essay, which is a criticism, or rather an appreciation, of General J. C. Smuts's *Holism and Evolution*, originally appeared as a series of articles in the weekly press of Cape Town. General Smuts's work is a philosophical interpretation of the phenomena of the visible world, the main idea of which is "that evolution is creative, that is to say, each forward move in the process results in a new *totum* or whole (hence, from the Greek, the name *Holism*), which is something more than the total sum of the constitutent parts" (p. 3). Mgr. Kolbe endeavors to show how this theory fits in with the traditional teaching of Catholic philosophy. In doing so he appeals to the authority of St. Augustine and St. Basil and to that of St. Thomas and the Scholastics. Nay, he goes even further and summons St. Paul to bear witness to the extension of Holism to the spiritual universe. While thus championing the philosophical views of General Smuts, Mgr. Kolbe does not neglect to point out the erroneous interpretations into which the scholarly General sometimes falls. Catholics, according to Mgr. Kolbe, may go all the way with General Smuts along the straight path of Holism; they may even encourage him to continue his journey beyond the point he has reached; but they will not accompany him on all his side-trips when he leaves the main road.

A Catholic View of Holism may or may not represent the attitude of the Church toward the questions raised. The author is careful

to state that he speaks only for himself. Yet we feel that in the main his arguments are sound from the standpoint of logic and orthodoxy alike. His little volume is a valuable addition to Catholic thought on evolution.

BIRTH-CONTROL AND EUGENICS. In the Light of Fundamental Ethical Principles. By the Rev. Charles P. Bruehl, Ph.D. New York: Joseph F. Wagner, Inc. Pp. 249.

Only one chapter of this book discusses birth control, but that one presents a very good summary of the arguments against the practice. The first chapter gives a general survey of "The Present and the Prospective Situation," while the last is a "Summary Recapitulation". The other twelve chapters deal with race improvement, the so-called unfit, the various aspects of sterilization and eugenics. The whole volume constitutes an up-to-date, discriminating and comprehensive, though relatively brief, discussion of all the subjects with which it deals. In this wide and difficult province, there is probably no other single volume in English which is quite as useful, particularly for the average reader and the reader who lacks the time to consult several books. The author's summary of the ethical aspect of sterilization is worth quoting in full:

"Society has the right to protect itself adequately against the danger resulting from the presence and the increase of the mentally diseased. If sterilization can be proved to be the only sufficient means by which this purpose can be accomplished and national degeneration staved off, public authority cannot be denied the right to use it for the protection of the common good, which, according to the teaching of Moral Theology, prevails over private interests. From this abstract argument, however, it is a far cry to the practical conclusion that the State in the present condition of affairs actually may exercise this theoretical right. For, as things are at present, national degeneration is not imminent, and consequently the right of national self-preservation may not be invoked. Besides, sterilization is not the only means available for the protection of the community, and, as long as other means more consonant with human dignity and less subject to serious abuses can achieve the same purpose, the State may not resort to this drastic measure, which cannot but be regarded as a grave mutilation and constitutes a violation of human personality that requires for its justification a commensurate cause. Whatever, therefore, may be said with regard to the theoretical aspects of the case (which at that are not entirely clear), in practice eugenical sterilization of the unfit cannot be justified at the present stage of affairs and must be condemned as an unwarranted assault on human rights."

SAINT FRANCOIS D'ASSISE ET SON OEUVRE (Bibliothèque d'Etudes Franciscaines). By R. P. Achille Léon, O.F.M. Paris: P. Lethielleux. 1928. Pp. 396.

THE LIFE OF ST. FRANCIS OF ASSISI. By Luigi Salvatorelli, translated from the Italian by Eric Sutton. New York: Alfred A. Knopf. 1928. Pp. 313.

IRELAND'S TRIBUTE TO SAINT FRANCIS. Edited by the Rev. Gregory Cleary, O.F.M. Dublin: M. H. Gill and Son, Ltd. 1928. Pp. 148.

With the approval of their Ministers Provincial the French Franciscans have decided to collaborate in the production and publication of works that are to constitute a "Library of Franciscan Studies". The first contribution to this Library is quite appropriately "a history of the Order of Friars Minor from its beginnings to our day". But, as the author, the Rev. Achille Léon, O.F.M., concedes in the Preface, "one must not expect to find here a detailed, complete, and conclusive history of the Franciscan Order. It is made up rather of general surveys for the purpose of leading the French public to at least a summary knowledge of the Order of Friars Minor." The surveys are well written, however, and give the reader a fair idea of the tremendous activity and influence of the Franciscan Order during the seven centuries of its existence. In an Appendix the author devotes special attention to the history of the friars in France since their restoration in 1850. Throughout the volume the author confines himself to the Franciscan Order strictly so-called, treating only incidentally the Order of Poor Clares, the Third Order, the Conventuals (after 1517), and the Capuchins (after 1525). As the work is intended for the general reading public, all critical apparatus and all matters of controversy are consistently avoided. Although in most respects far inferior to Holzapfel's classic, *Handbuch der Geschichte des Franziskanerordens,* this history of the Franciscans by Father Léon will unquestionably serve the purpose for which it was written.

The same is true of *The Life of St. Francis of Assisi* so charmingly translated from the Italian by Eric Sutton. In development of theme, literary style, and historical expression we have in this work a striking verification of Jusserand's recent dictum: "History is not simply an art, nor simply a science; . . . it participates in the nature of both." In the present *Life* of the great saint of Assisi the artistic element predominates, though it is based in most cases on scientific investigation. It is an interpretation of St. Francis

and the Franciscan movement, sympathetic throughout and in places highly poetical. What we miss, however, is that atmosphere of deep faith which inspired every act of St. Francis and which made him not only a poetic lover of God and His creatures but also and above all a loyal and devoted child of the Catholic Church. There are allusions and expressions in this work which may be due to the fact that it is a translation, but which certainly do not show that the author fully grasped and completely sympathized with the great ideal that motivated the life and activity of St. Francis. In this respect it is considerably less satisfactory than Joergensen's beautiful biography of the saint or Felder's fascinating volume on *The Ideals of St. Francis of Assisi.* Before reading this translation of Salvatorelli's work, it will be well to read first Father Cuthbert's *Life of St. Francis of Assisi* and in this way forestall any misconception that the other more poetic biography might create concerning the true significance and import of St. Francis and the Franciscan movement.

A more worthy and valuable contribution to Franciscan literature, though perhaps not so pretentious and in no way imaginative, is *Ireland's Tribute to St. Francis.* This splendid little volume contains seven lectures on various phases of Franciscan activity. They are the lectures that were delivered at the National University of Dublin during the celebration in that city of the Seventh Centenary of the Death of St. Francis. The lectures are the product of ripe scholarship in matters of Franciscan lore and they demonstrate how the spirit of St. Francis still hovers over the Emerald Isle where in days gone by his followers exerted such a wide and salutary influence. Father Cleary has done the Franciscan Order and the students of its history a real service by collecting these lectures and publishing them in permanent form. We heartily recommend the volume to all who seek light and inspiration on such interesting topics as "The Irish Franciscans at Rome and Louvain in the Seventeenth Century", or "John Duns Scotus", or "St. Francis in Italian Literature". A unique picture of St. Francis from a painting by El Greco preserved in the National Gallery of Ireland forms the frontispiece to the volume, while the complete programme reproduced at the end of the volume shows how enthusiastically clergy and laity coöperated in making this celebration of the Franciscan centenary a memorable event in the annals of Dublin.

GUIDE PRATIQUE DE LA PROCEDURE MATRIMONIALE EN DROIT CANONIQUE. By Chanoine Henri Lanier, J.C.D., Vice-Officiel de Paris. Pierre Téqui, Paris. Pp. 81.

A plan for making the investigations preliminary to the trial forms the introduction to this treatment on matrimonial court procedure, divided by Dr. Lanier into three parts, as follows: 1. the summary procedure to be observed in exceptional cases where the ordinary rules need not be applied; 2. the normal procedure in trials concerning nullity; 3. the procedure to be observed in dispensing "*super rato et non consummato*".

To this treatment the author has added an appendix consisting of documents and formulas, followed by an alphabetical index to the book. It is the author's purpose to be practical. He has therefore avoided theoretical discussions and omitted the procedure for separation "quoad torrum et habitationem", since, in France, ecclesiastical sentences of separation do not produce their effect civilly. It seems that the author would have done better to interchange chapters I and II in place, thus conforming to the more logical order of the Code. When quoting decrees, etc. he would enhance his work by giving the source, whether in text or in note. This excellent and practical guide will prove valuable to all priests and especially those engaged in the work of the matrimonial court.

POUR ETUDIER LE CODE DE DROIT CANONIQUE. By F. Cimetier, Director of the Seminary of St. Sulpice. J. Gabalda, Paris. Pp. 248.

After an historical introduction on the development of canon law M. Cimetier offers a supplement to the Code of Canon Law. This work, following the plan of the Code, is divided into five books. The author places under the proper canon, not only the responses of the Commission for the Interpretation of the Code, but also the decisions of the Roman Congregations and Tribunals, published in the official *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* and recognized canonical periodicals in various languages. Useless duplication of source matter is avoided by a system of cross references. In the general introduction, and as a preface to each book of the treatment, he mentions the title and place of publication of the more important books and articles, explanatory of that particular phase of the law. This complete, compact, well ordered and authenticated short-cut to post-Code legislation, from the years of 1917-1927, will be valuable to, and greatly appreciated by, all students of canonical jurisprudence.

THE ENGLISH MYSTICS. David Knowles, O.S.B. Benziger Brothers, New York. 1927. Pp. ix + 210.

Those who are interested in the history or the way of mysticism will welcome this study of English medieval mystics, who until recently have been almost forgotten. Part I consists of a few remarks on mysticism and the mystical experience. The body of the work, introduced by a chapter on the epoch of the mystics, is an account of the lives and writings of five medieval mystics: the author of the *Ancren Riwle*, Richard Rolle, the author of *The Cloud of Unknowing*, Dame Julian of Norwich, and Walter Hilton, to which has been added a chapter on the Elizabethan Benedictine, Father Baker, many of whose manuscripts were methodically digested and edited after his death as the ascetical classic, *Sancta Sophia*. The study closes with a descriptive summary of the general characteristics of the English mystics. The selective bibliography of Mysticism in General and of the English Mystics, both in general and in particular, will be found helpful.

SOME SPIRITUAL GUIDES OF THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY. From the French of Abbé Huvelin. Translated, with an introduction, by the Rev. Joseph Leonard, C.M. Benziger Brothers, New York. 1927. Pp. lxxvii + 195.

Abbé Huvelin, a saintly French priest, who died in 1910, was justly renowned for his ability to guide souls in the spiritual life. This work consists of a series of his instructions given especially for young people in 1878-79. A number of holy men contributed to the revival of ecclesiastical spirit and Christian piety in France during the seventeenth century, but the outstanding characters treated in this volume are St. Francis de Sales, the gracious Bishop of Geneva; Monsieur Olier, who founded the seminary of St. Sulpice; St. Vincent de Paul, the Apostle of Charity; and Abbé de Rancé, who brought in the monastic reform of La Trappe. The conferences, or catechism lessons as Abbé Huvelin insisted, are simple and sympathetic discourses, drawn from the extensive knowledge of a scholar and informed with the deep appreciation of a priestly character. They are unusually human and interesting. All emphasize the rôle of their respective subjects in the guidance of souls. A rather long introduction sketches the life of the Abbé himself and describes by concrete examples his own power to direct souls in the way of perfection.

THROUGH THE LANE OF STARS. Sister M. Eleanore, C.S.C., Ph.D. D. Appleton & Co., New York. 1928. Pp. xvii + 267.

Sister Eleanore needs no introduction to the reading public. She has already made a host of friends with her charming and polished essays and the several books which she has published. She now addresses herself to children, relating to them a round dozen interesting stories of holy men and women. Her characters belong to a number of different nations and range in time from the early Christian centuries to almost our own day. St. Patrick, St. Dominic, St. Elizabeth of Hungary, St. Stanislaus, and the Blessed Isaac Jogues are among the subjects of her story-telling art. There is an appropriate sketch with each of the stories. In the Foreword, the Rev. Daniel A. Lord, S.J., tells the "Boys and Girls who open This Book" how happy he is at its appearance, and in the Afterword, he urges the parents of these same boys and girls to give their children saints to admire and to imitate.

VICTIM SOULS. Abbé Paulin Giloteaux. Translated from the French by L. M. G. Bond. Benziger Brothers, New York. Pp. xix + 277.

One is inclined to marvel at the number of spiritual books coming from the pens of French writers, and not a few of these are appearing in English translations. One is also apt to be surprised at the earnestness and ability with which some of these writers treat of the spiritual life. The present work is a balanced study by one who approaches a difficult task in the spirit of caution, who endeavors to follow sound doctrine throughout, and who closes with a profession of absolute loyalty and submission to the Church. The learned and pious author develops the idea and history of sacrifice, leads his argument up to Christ—the perfect and eternal Victim—emphasizes that the highest form of imitation of the Master consists in becoming a victim and filling up those things that are wanting of the sufferings of Christ, and completes his treatise with an ascetical and mystical survey of the attitude, weapons, prayer, crosses and devotions of the victim soul. Topics often hotly disputed and no less often sources of ruin for the imprudent are handled with judicious care. Several passages are especially well done, e. g., that in Chapter IV of Part II which deals with the spiritual director. This study will prove a challenge to any soul which is earnest in the pursuit of perfection, and a treat to anyone who delights in the product of a cultured and Christian mind.

Literary Chat

The Sulpician Seminary Press at Washington publishes a little volume of *Meditations on the Passion and Eastertide,* by F. P. H. The Foreword tells us that the meditations were compiled many years ago for use in the Seminary of New York, and that typewritten copies have been in private circulation in various parts of the country. It would have been a pleasure to make known the author whose countless friends and admirers will find the little volume attractive because of him. The intimate and direct appeal that is at home in the Seminary has been retained. This is a distinct advantage for the priest who uses the work, since it brings back to him memories of the days when his spiritual ideals were undisturbed and his generosity toward God knew none of the reserves that later life at times creates. The volume may be commended without hesitation as one admirably adapted to its high purpose. The meditations are suited to any period in the year, since the death and resurrection of Christ make universal appeal regardless of time.

Those who were privileged to attend any of the sessions of the Eucharistic Congress in Chicago in 1926 recall the overwhelming impressions that were met at every turn. One felt inspired and humbled before the Eucharistic Presence which as a mighty force assembled representatives from nearly all of the nations of the world in continental splendor of worship. The Congress released one from ordinary limitations of emotion, language and mind and brought one close to spiritual reality in a new experience. All of the resources of faith, mind and symbolism were brought together in a way never before equaled. One person who was in attendance at the Pontifical Mass celebrated in the presence of 65,000 children went away and sought in the quiet of a little village an opportunity to realize all that that splendor meant in his own spiritual enrichment.

The publication of the official Report of the Congress revives our attention to its effect upon our national life. It makes a volume of 530 pages. It is attractively bound, well printed and illustrated. All of the sermons and the papers at the general and sectional meetings are published in full.

The Report appeals directly to all priests because it is an authentic contribution to the permanent literature on the Blessed Eucharist. It may well be recommended to the laity because it brings together an extraordinary range of interpretations of the meaning of the Eucharist in the Christian life. All who have spiritual imagination will find in it an impressive symbol of the universality of the Church, the record of her firm hold on this central truth of revelation in the face of a disturbed world that likes to minimize the interference of Almighty God with the waywardness of humanity. If the 1928 Congress about to be held in Australia approaches in any measure to the grandeur and splendid organization of the Chicago Congress we shall await the Report of the former with eager anticipation. (*The Twenty-Eighth International Eucharistic Congress,* held at Chicago, June 20-24. Compiled by the Rev. C. F. Donovan. Published as the Official Record by The Committee in Charge.)

His Eminence Cardinal Mundelein, under whose direction the Eucharistic Congress produced its extraordinary results, has recently published a number of letters and addresses which reveal a very wide range of spiritual and civic interests. (*Letters of a Bishop to his Flock;* Benziger Brothers.) The volume contains nine letters on Peter's Pence, nine on the Catholic Charities of Chicago, nine on Catholic Instruction, ten on War and Peace, four on the Eucharistic Congress, and thirteen letters and addresses on miscellaneous subjects.

One of the chief difficulties with spiritual books results from the fact that as much depends upon the reading of the book as upon the writing of it. An indifferent reader renders

the book all but futile unless power in exposition overcome indifference and compel attention. A thoughtful reader may get out of a book very much that even a competent author may not have foreseen. The latter type of reader will find in *The Art of Christ* (Dom Anscar Vonier, O.S.B.; Benziger Brothers) a series of excellent conferences on the elements of the spiritual life. They were prepared for a retreat to Catholic ladies in England. They bring the commonplace experiences of every-day life into close relation with spiritual truth. The tone of kindness and sympathy that prevails throughout the conferences does not prevent the author from calling attention to homely faults which so often escape spiritual watchfulness. Priests who give lay retreats will find the little volume extremely helpful, and priests who do not give retreats will find it well worth thoughtful reading.

It is difficult to keep up, as the phrase is, with the literature on Saint Teresa of Lisieux. It is impossible to measure the extent to which the veneration of her has seized the mind of the Catholic world. The extent of this literature and earnestness of popular veneration of the Saint give us a rather exacting standard by which to judge a new book when it appears. Benziger Brothers have just brought out a translation, by the Benedictines of Stanbrook, of *Saint Teresa of Lisieux, A Spiritual Renascence*, by Father Henry Pettitot, O.P. It is a most satisfactory volume. Our readers are sufficiently familiar with the life of the Saint to make unnecessary any review of the contents of the work. Attention may be directed, however, to the method of treatment because of its value in understanding the Saint and in improving the self-knowledge of those who venerate her.

The author devotes four chapters to what he calls the negative characteristics of Saint Teresa's spirituality. They are "The Absence of Any Violent or Self-imposed Mortifications", "No Fixed Methods of Meditation", "The Absence of Frequent Extraordinary Favors", "No Multifarious Activities". The attitude of description rather than judgment is held throughout.

In the second part of the volume the author describes three paradoxes in the character of the Saint: "Simplicity and Prudence", "Littleness and Greatness", "Joy of Heart amid Suffering". He uses the term antinomy or paradox to indicate "the opposition of two virtues or truths which, even to the names by which they are known, appear to be incompatible" (page 153). The supreme problem in character building is that of combining rather than defining virtues. Unfortunately we isolate them from one another in the formalism of the text book definition. Anyone can be good in a one-sided way. Failure to take this wide view of one's qualities and reluctance to make the effort to discipline one virtue by another plays a large part in the defeat of grace in the spiritual life.

Father Pettitot gives us not only this correct angle of approach to the character of Saint Teresa but also a point of view for self-study. Too many of us trust our virtues as isolated from one another and fail to be interested in their relations among themselves. Wiseman says in one of his Meditations that it seems easier to imitate Christ than the saints because of the perfect balance of qualities in His divine character. The REVIEW commends this volume highly to all thoughtful admirers of the Saint.

The Parish Visitors of Mary Immaculate of New York City have put into permanent form in a volume of 317 pages the story of the work of His Eminence Cardinal Hayes, which appeared serially in the *Parish Visitor*. The subject matter is taken largely from addresses made on various occasions by His Eminence. The chapters are arranged in a way to furnish a smoothly running description of His Eminence, of his activities and of his interpretations of the relations of Catholic faith to life. It is not surprising that His Eminence's interest in Catholic Charities is set forth most impressively. Those who know the complexity of modern poverty, the extent and confusion of it and the conflicts of philosophy and practice in the field of Social Work, are in position to measure the courage, foresight, open-mindedness and

faith with which the Archdiocese of New York created, standardized and financed organized service of the under-privileged classes.

Two imposing volumes have been issued concerning the National Shrine of the Immaculate Conception now under construction on the grounds of the Catholic University. (*The Story of the Crypt*, by William P. Kennedy, Litt. D., and *The Mary Book*, by the Rev. Bernard A. McKenna, D.D. and William P. Kennedy, Litt.D., Salve Regina Press, Catholic University, Washington.) The first volume contains a detailed history of the Shrine to date, letters of approval from three Popes, endorsement of the plan by the Board of Trustees of the University and the Apostolic Delegate, Chronology of the Shrine and Crypt, architectural details and a key to the interpretation of all symbols and more important structural features. As progress gradually permitted the use of the Crypt, it became the center of various forms of service that develop naturally in the life of the University. The record of these is included in a way to furnish a very satisfactory picture of the work to date.

The second volume contains 800 selections which set forth in verse and prose the glories of Mary, the Mother of our Divine Lord. It is "the largest and most varied collection of Our Lady's praises yet published in English." The tributes thus brought together represent many years of research and a discriminating care in selecting them in a way to serve the priest in the pulpit, the teacher in the school, the devout client in Church or home or amidst the cares of life. Many centuries, many countries and languages are represented among the authors whose tributes are thus brought together in honor of Mary.

Both volumes are profusely illustrated, printed on heavy paper and well bound. Their appearance is in keeping with their mission. The reading of them cannot fail to associate the individual's veneration of Mary with the inspiring vision of her place in the divine plan of Redemption and the world-wide recognition of that place wherever the Catholic faith has quickened the hearts of worshipers of Christ. There can be no doubt that efforts to interest American Catholics in the construction of the Shrine of the Immaculate Conception have done very much to stimulate devotion, to clarify the understanding of the providential rôle of Our Blessed Mother and to purify Catholic life.

One of the earliest gifts to the Shrine was the original wooden altar used by Bishop John Carroll, first Catholic Bishop of the United States. Without a doubt the national appeal of the Shrine will rapidly attract similar gifts of an historical nature and create an atmosphere that will add its own charm to the surpassing beauty that the completed Shrine now promises.

Books Received

THEOLOGICAL AND DEVOTIONAL.

ADORATION. A Series of Readings, Prayers and Hymns Systematically Arranged for a Year's Holy Hour for Public and Private Devotion. By the Rev. Frederick A. Reuter. With a Foreword by the Right Rev. Joseph Schrembs, D.D., Bishop of Cleveland. Benziger Brothers, New York, Cincinnati, Chicago. 1928. Pp. 822. Price, $3.15 *postpaid.*

THE SPIRITUAL WAY. Preparation for Confession, Communion, Confirmation. By the Religious of the Cenacle. (*A Cenacle Publication*—Used in the Cenacle Demonstration Classes.) Original illustrations by Claire Armstrong. The Cenacle of St. Regis, 628 W. 140th St., New York; or the Cenacle Convents, 2nd and Battery Sts., Newport, R. Is.; 196 Lake St., Brighton, Mass.; 513 Fullerton Parkway, Chicago; Lake Ronkonkoma, L. Is., N. Y. Price, $1.25 *postpaid.*

BACK TO GOD. A Treatise on Confession, or the Sacrament of Penance. By the Rev. Fulgence Meyer, O.F.M., Missionary and author of *Uni Una, Plain Talks on Marriage, Youth's Pathfinder,* etc. St. Francis Book Shop, Cincinnati. 1928. Pp. v—574. Price, $2.00.

RELIGION. A Secondary School Course. Book One. By the Rev. Raymond J. Campion, S.T.B., M.A., Brooklyn Preparatory Seminary, Brooklyn, New York. Foreword by the Very Rev. Monsignor Joseph V. S. McClancy, LL.D., Superintendent of Schools, Diocese of Brooklyn. William H. Sadlier, New York. 1928. Pp. xii—321.

SACRAMENTALS AND SOME CATHOLIC PRACTICES. By Aidan Cardinal Gasquet, O.S.B. E. M. Lohmann Co., St. Paul, Minn. 1928. Pp. 111. Price, $1.25 *net.*

LE CRUCIFIX. Retraite sacerdotale. Par le R. P. Jean Emmanuel Baragnon, des Frères Prêcheurs, Prédicateur général. P. Lethielleux, Paris-VI[e]. 1928. Pp. vii—309. Prix, 12 *fr.* 75 *franco.*

L'HABITATION EN NOUS DES TROIS PERSONNES. Le Fait. Le Mode. Par Paul Galtier, S.J. Gabriel Beauchesne, Paris. 1928. Pp. xvi—262. Prix, 15 *fr.* 40 *franco.*

TRACTATUS DE DEO UNO ET TRINO. Auctore G. Van Noort, Parocho Amstelodamensi. Editionem quartam curavit J. P. Verhaar, S. Theol. in Seminario Warmundano Professor. Sumptibus Societatis Anonymae Pauli Brand, Hilversum in Hollandia. 1928. Pp. 228. Pretium, Ingen. 3 *fl.* 50.

TRACTATUS DE DEO REDEMPTORE. Auctore G. Van Noort, Parocho Amstelodamensi. Editionem quartam curavit J. P. Verhaar, S. Theologiae in Seminario Warmundano Professor. Sumptibus Societatis Editricis Anonymae (antea Pauli Brand), Hilversum in Hollandia. 1925. Pp. 208. Pretium, Ingen. 2 *fl.* 75.

VINCENZ PALLOTTI. Ein Apostel und Mystiker, 1795-1850. Von Eugen Weber, P.S.M. Mit einem Titelbild und 20 Tafeln mit 32 Bildern. Verlag der Kongregation der Pallottiner, Limburg a. d. Lahn. 1927. Seiten xvi—395.

PHILOSOPHICAL.

THE TRIUMPH OF LIFE, or Science and the Soul. By William Barry, D.D., Rector of St. Peter's, Leamington; Hon. Canon of St. Chad's, Birmingham; Protonotary Apostolic; sometime Professor of Theology in Oscott College; author of *The Two Standards, Heralds of Revolt* and *Roma Sacra.* Longmans, Green & Co., New York, London, Toronto, Calcutta, Bombay and Madras. 1928. Pp. xi—247. Price, $4.00.

SCHOLASTIC METAPHYSICS. By John F. McCormick, S.J., Professor of Philosophy in Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wisconsin. Part I: Being, Its Divisions and Causes. Loyola University Press, Chicago. 1928. Pp. xix—253. Price, $2.00.

CATHOLICISM AND THE CATHOLIC MIND. By Winfred Ernest Garrison. Willett, Clark & Colby, Chicago. 1928. Pp. 267. Price, $2.50.

HISTORICAL.

AMERICA'S FOUNDERS AND LEADERS. A Biographical History of the United States for the Lower Grades of Catholic Schools. With Teacher's Manual. By William H. J. Kennedy, Ph.D., Dean, The Teachers' College of the City of Boston, and Sister Mary Joseph, Ph.D., Sisters of St. Dominic, Caldwell, N. J. Benziger Brothers, New York, Cincinnati, Chicago. 1928. Pp. xiv—352 and 27. List price, $1.12.

LA VERDAD SOBRE MÉJICO. O Antecedentes Historicos, Origen, Desarrollo y Vicisitudes de la Persecucion Religiosa en Méjico. Nicolás Marín Negueruela. Segunda edicion. Tipografía Católica Casals, Barcelona. Pp. viii—376. Precio, 5 *pesetas.*